

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XX.

JULY, 1916.

No. 3.

“HOW OLD IS MAN?”

The antiquity of man is discussed in an article recently contributed by Theodore Roosevelt to the *National Geographic Magazine*.¹⁾ The article purports to give a brief summary of that which has been ascertained by anthropological science in answer to the question, “How old is man?” and by reason of the distinguished name of its author has received wide attention. Mr. Roosevelt intends to trace the prehistory of man, “the history of his development from an apelike creature struggling with his fellow-brutes.” He refers to a past geologic age, when “man was slowly developing from the half-human to the wholly human,” “from a strong and cunning brute into a man having dominion over all brutes, and kinship with worlds lying outside and beyond our own,” and intends to summarize “all that has been discovered and soundly determined” since Darwin wrote his *Descent of Man*. Mr. Roosevelt refers with undisguised disdain to those who once “disbelieved in the antiquity of man,” and his article leaves no doubt in the reader’s mind that in the opinion of Mr. Roosevelt this disbelief in the evolutionistic thesis concerning the origin and ancestry of man has been amply proven unfounded by the facts. His assertions are made with a calm emphasis, which cannot fail to impress the unsophisticated reader. We are invited to consider “man as he was up to the end of paleolithic times.” “The records show that man has lived in France for at least 100,000 years.”

The illustrations which accompany the article add to the

1) February, 1916: “How Old Is Man?”

impression that the question "How old is man?" may now be answered with the testimony of well-established scientific proof; for have we not here the "Ape-man of Java, a Pre-human Creature, Who Lived Probably 500,000 Years Ago"? Have we not a head reconstructed on the Piltdown Skull? Do we not observe the trend towards the human in the reconstructed Neanderthal Man on page 120? Does not a half-tone on page 124 show this same Neanderthal Man chipping a piece of flint into arrow-heads, and the Cro-Magnon Man in the act of drawing a bison on the wall of his cave? The unavoidable impression is conveyed that we are moving along lines well established by scientific research, and that it is no longer "necessary to argue with those who disbelieve the antiquity of man." It is with this latter presumption that we intend to deal in our discussion of Mr. Roosevelt's article. Frankly, *we disbelieve* the antiquity of man, and it is our purpose to show that Mr. Roosevelt has, in his discussion of the question, "How old is man?" introduced no facts which have caused us to waver in our adherence to the record in Genesis, and, furthermore, that the distinguished contributor to the *National Geographic Magazine* has withheld from his readers certain facts, which, if presented, would have materially depressed the interest of the public in his conclusions.

Mr. Roosevelt's article is, in substance, a *resumé* of Mr. Henry F. Osborn's book *Men of the Old Stone Age*, which, in his opinion, sums up the assured results of research, and constitutes the unanimous consensus of scholarship. Is Mr. Roosevelt right in both these assumptions? Only when the question is approached: Whence did these various forms of ape-man originate, and how are they related to one another and to recent man? does the author caution his readers that here Mr. Osborn "states his conclusions as strong probabilities, not certainties." But this closing paragraph of Mr. Roosevelt's article serves the purpose of deepening the impression that all that has been said about the nature and antiquity of the fossil remains in the preceding paragraphs is based upon

the unquestioned and unanimous agreement of scholarship. Again we ask, Is Mr. Roosevelt justified in this initial assumption? The question can best be answered by taking up seriatim the evidence adduced for the evolutionistic view of human origins.

PITHECANTHROPUS ERECTUS.

Pithecanthropus Erectus is the name invented by Haeckel for the "missing link," and given by Dr. Eugene Du Bois, a Dutch physician, to certain remains discovered by him on the island of Java in 1891. The remains consist of "an imperfect cranium, a femur bearing evidence of prolonged disease, and a molar tooth." (Dana, *Manual of Geology*, p. 1036.) The discoverer of these bones asserts that he found them in Pleistocene deposits, and believes that they are the remains of a being between the man-apes and man. Prof. Virchow and other specialists in anatomy examined this find. It was established that the femur was found a year after the cranium. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Vol. XXII, p. 336) describes the skull as follows: "The forehead is extremely low, with beetling brow-ridges, and the whole calvarium presents a curiously gibbon-like aspect." Some regard the remains as belonging to a low-grade man or to an idiot. (Dana, *l. c.*) The cubic measurement of the skull is 60 cubic inches, about that of an idiot, that of a normal man being 90 cubic inches and that of an ape 30. These specimens were found in separate places. The skull is too small for the thigh-bone. The age of the strata in which they were found is uncertain. The assumptions on which the claims made for these bones are based are the following: First, that they are as old as claimed, 100,000 years at least, or a million, as stated by some. Secondly, that these bones belong to the same individual. Thirdly, that they are the remains of a full-grown individual. Fourthly, that they are the remains of a human or semihuman being. An authority of the first rank, Prof. Klaatsch, of Heidelberg University, says that the *savants* may be right in inferring from the fragmental Javan remains that they belong either to the

most manlike of apes or the most apelike of men, but that the creature doe *not* supply the missing link in a pedigree beginning in a simian and ending in *homo sapiens*.

Upon such a floating foundation of scientific surmise Mr. Roosevelt presumes to build a very substantial structure. He says: After the prehuman days of man, probably branching off from the stem of the anthropoid apes, comes "the famous ape-man of Java, the pithecanthropus, the prehuman creature, —probably, however, only collaterally in our line of ancestry, —who appeared at the dawn of the Pleistocene. This being was already half-way upward from the beast, half-way between true man and those Miocene ancestors of his who were still on the psychic and intellectual level of their diverging kinsfolk, the anthropoid apes. He, or some creature like him, was in our own line of ascent during the uncounted ages when our ancestors were already different from all other brutes, and yet had not grown to be really men. He probably used a stone or club at need; and about this time may have begun very rudely to chip or otherwise fashion stones to his use." All this detail concerning the pithecanthropus from its Miocene "ancestors" to its rudely fashioned tools is purely the product of imagination, starting from three or four broken bones and the evolutionary theory. We have not seen Mr. Osborn's book, upon which Mr. Roosevelt relies for his facts. Possibly it treats the pithecanthropus as an ancestor in the direct line of the descent of man. If it does, the author stands alone among modern scientists, who are substantially agreed with Dr. Klaatsch that the being of which Du Bois discovered the remains is not "probably," but most certainly, outside the direct line of human descent. These bones, then, have no place in a discussion of the question, "How old is man?"²⁾

2) To build upon such slight evidence a theory of human descent is hazardous also in view of the fact that the evidence of bones and other remains is now generally suspected. It has been found that even in the case of recent remains, as in criminal trials, experts are often unable to decide whether they are human or brute, recent or remote, and what part of the frame they occupied.

THE PILTDOWN SKULL.

"After the ape-man of Java," continues Mr. Roosevelt, "we skip a quarter of a million years or so—according to Mr. Osborn's conservative figuring—before we get our next glimpse of a near-human predecessor of ours. This is the Heidelberg Man, who lived in the warm second interglacial period, surrounded by a fauna of huge and fearsome beasts, which included the saber-tooth and the hippopotamus, etc. He was a chinless being, whose jaw was still so primitive that it must have made his speech imperfect; and he was so much lower than any existing savage as to be at least specifically distinct, that is, he can be called 'human' only if the word is used with a certain largeness. Again we make a long skip, this time of somewhat over a hundred thousand years, and come to the Piltdown Man, or near-man—a being seemingly little more advanced than the man of Heidelberg, and in some ways less so, for he possessed apelike canine teeth." In a burst of confidence the author then admits that there is room for "considerable difference of opinion" regarding the age of these "very early near-human remains," and their exact relation to the human race; yet this admission, if anything, deepens the impression that as to the near-human characteristics of all these remains and their significance as evidence of brute ancestorship of man there can be no manner of doubt. What are the facts?

Mr. Roosevelt, on page 119, shows a reproduction of the Piltdown Man, "believed to have lived in England and France 100,000 to 300,000 years ago." The wide disparity of these estimates of antiquity should in themselves bid one pause before one accepts the very unprepossessing creature depicted here as an ancestor of man. Our faith in this reconstruction is yet more rudely shaken when the testimony of Dr. Arthur Keith, the anatomical expert of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, is heard. It is true that Dr. Smith Woodward and Dr. Charles Dawson, in reconstructing a man from the Piltdown³⁾ skull, built up something essentially monkey-like,

3) Discovered in 1912 on Piltdown Common, near Uckfield, Sussex, England.

with receding forehead, projecting brows, and a gorilla-like lower jaw. Prof. Keith, checking up on this reconstruction, comes to an entirely different conclusion. He finds that the work of Drs. Dawson and Woodward was done in open defiance of all that scientists know about skulls, whether ancient or modern. He writes:—

"That the Piltdown find is the most important discovery of its kind ever made will be freely granted by all who have inquired into man's ancient history.

"Nothing can detract from the debt which we owe to Charles Dawson and Dr. Smith Woodward on this score. It was natural that they should be influenced by the beliefs of the time. The evidence as regards antiquity of the Piltdown race pointed, in their opinions, to a very early phase of the Pleistocene period. It was the date at which man should still be struggling toward a human form, if the accepted opinion was well founded.

"In the chin region of the lower jaw of the Piltdown skull the discoverers found that the characters were absolutely apelike, absolutely unhuman. The characters of the chin dominated their work when they came to fit the parts of the skull together; so certain were they that they had found a real intermediate stage between ape and man that they abandoned all the precepts of the ordinary anatomist. It was recognized that all the parts of the skull, barring their massive thickness, had the same characters as modern man, only the chin was different. In the skull, eventually reconstructed, representing the form of man's head in the early Pleistocene, one could recognize a mixture of features, recalling a microcephalic idiot's skull on the one hand and a chimpanzee's on the other.

"This hybrid skull was received with open arms by the orthodox anthropologists. They were comforted to know that their beliefs had been well founded, even if their early-Pleistocene ancestors proved to be but half an ape. As for myself, it was necessary to examine again my facts, inferences, and beliefs, and see how they could be fitted to meet the evidence

yielded by Piltdown; for at first I accepted implicitly the skull reconstructed.

"Until Mr. Dawson's discovery I was certain we had followed the modern man back beyond the middle of the Pleistocene, and on other evidence had postulated that long before the dawn of the Pleistocene period it would be found that man had attained a full-sized brain. There were also the important discoveries of Benjamin Harrison and J. Reid Moir. They had found flints which had been shaped by the hand of man before the middle of the Pliocene period.

"Matters had reached this stage when I returned from a glorious golfing holiday in Cornwall early in the summer of the present year. On my return I found waiting me excellent casts of the various fragments of the Piltdown skull, which had been prepared by F. O. Barlow. Sitting down to mark out these Piltdown fragments on a modern skull in order that visitors to the museum of the Royal College of Surgeons might quickly perceive how they differed from the corresponding parts of modern man, I was surprised to find that the area of the ancient parts was much larger than their modern representatives. I also observed that the squamosal—the bone which forms the side of the skull between the ear and the forehead—was much larger than in modern skulls.

"That was altogether unexpected, as in all ancient skulls, especially skulls of the Neanderthal race, this bone is particularly small. My curiosity was aroused. I soon saw that the parts of the reconstructed Piltdown skull had been apposed in a manner which was in open defiance of all that was known of skulls ancient and modern, human and anthropoid. Articulating the bones in a manner which has been accepted by all anatomists in all times, I found that the brain-chamber, instead of measuring 1,070 cubic cm., as in Dr. Smith Woodward's reconstruction, measured 1,500 cubic cm.—a large brain-chamber for even modern man.

"Comparing the impressions left by the convolutions of the brain on the Piltdown skull with those on a modern skull,

I found a close correspondence. It was then apparent a very great mistake had been made; the ancient man of Piltdown *had a brain as big as modern man.*"

Until the controversy has been settled by the scientists now at loggerheads over the Piltdown skull, no one should pass off one of the several "reconstructions" of the Piltdown Man with an air of scientific finality, as is done by Mr. Roosevelt in the *National Geographic Magazine*. An honest presentation of the facts would not have ignored the wide divergency in the opinions of Drs. Woodward and Dawson, and Dr. Keith, and the controversy which the disagreement of these leaders has called forth. The statement that there is "room for considerable difference of opinion" as to the age of these specimens and their relation to human ancestry does not touch the matter which concerns us here. The impression is left by Mr. Roosevelt's article that, whatever the age of these fossils, and whatever their relationship to our race, the reconstructions based upon them, — with "primitive jaw," "chinless being," "lower than any existing savage," etc., — are the unquestioned result of scientific research. *They are not.* Until the leading authorities have settled their dispute concerning the appearance of the man of Piltdown, that specimen must be ruled out, even on scientific grounds, as evidence pointing to the descent of man from animal ancestors.

TH. GRAEBNER.

(To be continued.)

BETROTHAL AND MARRIAGE.

If the Bible is to be considered as the Word of God at all, it certainly must be considered as the *eternal* truth. (John 17, 17.) It is not only the norm of doctrine, but the rule of life for all stations and conditions of mankind until the end of time. When, therefore, the statement appeared in a recently published pamphlet: "Sofort nach dem Verloebnis sind die Verlobten vor Gott Ehemann und Ehefrau. Ihre Ehe ist nach

der Schrift eine geschlossene, aber noch nicht vollzogene Ehe" (Kretzmann, *Keuschheit und Zucht*, p. 76), it never entered the author's mind that this statement would be objected to as a "Missourian conception of betrothment," and therefore as something strange and unusual. The fact that a "rightful and valid betrothal is, *in foro ecclesiae*, tantamount to a marriage," was held, not only in the Church of the Old Testament, but also in the Church of the New Testament at all times.

From the many testimonies concerning this doctrine we select only a few at random. Siricius (Pope, 384—398) writes: "Nemini licet alterius sponsam uxorem ducere." (Migne, *Patrologiae latinae*, 13, 1136.) Leo Magnus (Pope, 440—461) uses almost the same expression: "Nemo alteri desponsatam ducat uxorem." (Migne, *op. cit.*, 54, 557.) Fulgentius, in his *Breviatio Canonum*, states the doctrine of the Church as follows: "Ut sponsatae puellae, si ab aliis raptae fuerint, sponso priori reddantur." (Migne, *op. cit.*, 67, 957.) Isidor Hispalensis, in his collection of *Decreta Conciliorum*, has the following resolution of the Concilium Ancyritanum: "Desponsatas puellas et postea ab aliis raptas placuit erui et his reddi, quibus fuerant antea desponsatae." (Migne, *op. cit.*, 84, 106.) In the *Decretum Gratiani* we find the following passages: "Puellam alii desponsatam alter accipere non valet. Quod autem post parentum sponsonem aliis nubere non valeant. . . . Ecce, quod non licet parentibus sponsalia filiorum suorum frangere." (Migne, *op. cit.*, 187, 1412. 1462.)

In the Lutheran Church this Scriptural doctrine has therefore always been held. Luther himself writes: "Da siehest du, dass eine vertraute Braut eine Ehefrau heisst in der Schrift. . . . Es ist ebensowohl eine Ehe nach dem oeffentlichen Verloebnis als nach der Hochzeit." (X, 922 ff.) For the statements of the faculties at Jena and Wittenberg see Baier, Ed. Walther, III, 752 f. This doctrine of Holy Scripture was plainly expressed in some of the old Lutheran marriage rituals. In the Brandenburg-Nuremberg *Agenda* that portion reads: "The marriage vows which ye have pledged

one to the other in the presence of God and His holy congregation I here confirm." In the *Eisleben Manual* of 1563 we read: "This marriage, ordered and ordained by God Almighty between you, I confirm." In the *Lower Saxon Agenda* of 1585 it is said: "The persons here present have, in the customary manner, with the knowledge of their parents on both sides, . . . entered into the holy estate of matrimony." Cf. Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopedia*, VII, 199; also Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, I, 36 ff.

In the American Lutheran Church the Scriptural doctrine concerning betrothals has, in general, been upheld. In the *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, edited by Jacobs and Haas, the following statement regarding betrothal was entered: "According to the maxim that *consensus, non concubitus, facit matrimonium*, betrothal is the very essence of marriage, and is, therefore, binding upon the parties, making them essentially husband and wife before God." (p. 49.) Other testimonies are the following: "Weil sie verlobt waren, darum nennt der Engel Maria das Gemahl Josephs. Daraus sehen wir, dass Verlobte Eheleute sind. Die Ehe wird geschlossen durch die Verlobung oder das Verlobnis." (Mezger, *Entwurfe zu Katechesen*, p. 48.) "Wenn ein Mann und ein Weib, die zur Ehe tuechtig sind und nicht in zu naher Verwandtschaft stehen, sich mit Einwilligung ihrer Eltern verlobt, sich die Ehe versprochen haben, so sind sie vor Gott zur Ehe verbunden." (Schmidt, *Katechismuspredigten*, p. 72.) "The fundamental maxim governing all cases of breach of betrothal is that valid betrothal is, *in foro ecclesiae*, essentially marriage." (Dr. Graebner, in *THEOL. QUART.*, IV, 458.)

Keeping all this in mind, it seems strange that exception should be taken to this definition in Lutheran circles of our own country. The statement of the *Kirchenblatt* of the Iowa Synod that this exposition of the doctrine concerning betrothal is "not the conception of betrothal which is found in wide circles of the Lutheran Church," and that of the *Wachende Kirche* of the Buffalo Synod that "all experience is opposed

to it and also the practise of the Church," may both be dismissed as arguments without validity, not being based upon Holy Scriptures. Another statement by the *Kirchenblatt*, however, contains an element of danger, since we read: "To assume that every other conception but that defended by the author be wrong and sinful would mean binding the Church of Jesus *under the Jewish yoke*." If the statement that a valid betrothal is, in the sight of God and the Church, tantamount to a marriage was merely a part of the Jewish church law, then there certainly would be reason for objecting to "being entangled again with a yoke of bondage." Let us see what evidence the Bible offers.

There are three passages in the Old Testament which would tend to corroborate the idea that the validity of a rightful betrothal, as stated above, was in force for the Jews only, besides the account in the Book of Tobith. The passage Deut. 22, 23. 24 reads: "If a damsel that is a *virgin* be *betrothed* unto a *husband*, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her, then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled *his neighbor's wife*." We find almost the same statement Deut. 28, 30: "Thou shalt *betroth a wife*, and another man shall lie with her"; *i. e.*, Thou shalt give the usual engagement presents, and thereby make a woman thy wife. The passage Hos. 4, 13 has been translated: "Your spouses shall commit adultery." The word "spouse" here means "espoused wife," in spite of the suggestion of Gesenius to translate "daughters-in-law," for כַּלָּה undoubtedly means "betrothed wife" in other passages, such as Jer. 2, 32; Is. 49, 18; 61, 10; Jer. 7, 34; 16, 9, and elsewhere. Luther is correct in translating: "Und eure *Braute* zu Ehebrecherinnen werden," as is also the Vulgate: "Et *sponsae* vestrae adulterae erunt." The manner of betrothal is described in the Book of Tobith, 6, 19; 7, 15. 16.

If we, then, for the present, grant the contention that

these passages as they stand may be considered merely as a part of the Jewish church law, the Jewish account of the manner and the validity of betrothal should prove interesting. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* says of this: "The first step toward marriage was betrothal, involving the consent of the parent or guardian of the girl and the payment of a price. The act of betrothal is expressed by the Hebrew word 'aras'; the price paid, by 'mohar.' The 'mohar' may be in the form of service in the field or in war. Probably it was customary, even in early times, to give the bride some portion of the 'mohar,' or, at least, to give her presents. After betrothal the bride might be taken to her husband's house, and the nuptials celebrated either immediately or later. The initial steps, it appears, were customarily taken by the parents of the suitor, who formally made the proposal. Not infrequently, however, in the comparatively free social intercourse of those days, the young man and woman had met and formed a mutual attachment resulting in a love-match. *After betrothal* the bride was subject to the *same restrictions as a wife*. Of the marriage ceremonial little is known; it is not mentioned at all in the story of Isaac, while in that of Jacob a marriage feast and a nuptial week are spoken of. The central features in later times were the wedding-procession and the wedding-feast. The bridegroom in festive attire, and accompanied by his friends, went to the home of the bride, whence she, likewise in bridal garments, veiled and accompanied by her companions, was led to the house of his parents. The procession was enlivened by songs by, or in praise of, the bride and bridegroom, and was lighted, if in the evening, by torches or lamps. There followed the nuptial feast in the house of the bridegroom, and the subsequent festivities sometimes continued for several days." This description is based principally upon Bible passages. There is another account, however, which describes the Jewish betrothment according to its nature, term, form, etc., and is based upon the Rabbinical Law. It is by Mielziner, in his book *The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce*, from which

we quote (p. 75 ff.): "A betrothment is termed, in Rabbinical Law, *kiddushin*, or, also, *arusin*. The former of these two terms refers especially to the act of betrothing, while the latter indicates the state of being betrothed. The betrothed parties are called, respectively, *arus* and *arusa*. The meaning of a betrothment, according to Rabbinical Law, differs essentially from the idea usually connected with that term in our day. In modern Law betrothment is defined to be 'a contract between a man und woman by which they agree that at a future time they will marry each other.' Such a contract is of a purely civil nature. It may be dissolved by either party, or both, at pleasure. The nature of betrothment, according to the Rabbinical Law, is quite different. There a *betrothal* is not a mere promise to marry, but it is the *very initiation of marriage*. The betrothed parties are in some respects regarded as married, though not yet entitled to the marital rights, nor bound to fulfil any of the mutual duties of conjugal life, as long as the marriage was not consummated by the nuptials. The betrothment could be dissolved only through death or a formal bill of divorce. Faithlessness on the part of the betrothed female was treated as *adultery*. Without having been formally divorced, she could not enter a marriage contract with another person; if entered upon, it was void." It will be seen from this account that the Rabbinical Law agrees exactly with the Bible.

To return, however, to the passages quoted above: Do these really concern the Jews only, and are their commands not binding upon the people of our day? A simple way to determine whether a law given to the Jews specifically has validity for all times is to see if it is also found outside of the police and church regulations of the Jewish code. And here we readily find statements which prove that the Biblical law concerning valid betrothals is in force to this day. When Lot was urged to make haste out of the doomed city, he went out to speak to his "sons-in-law that would marry his daughters," who were betrothed to them and wanted to consummate this marriage later on. (Gen. 19, 14.) When Jacob, with the

consent of the parents on either side (Gen. 28, 2; 29, 18. 19), was betrothed to Rachel, the daughter of Laban, he spoke of her as his "wife" before the marriage had taken place. (Gen. 29, 21.) Both of these events took place before the Jewish church law was in existence. A similar case is recorded in the New Testament. When Mary was "espoused to Joseph, before they came together," Joseph is called her "husband," and she is called his "wife." (Matt. 1, 18—20.) And in Luke 2, 5 Mary is called Joseph's "espoused wife." (Cf. Luke 1, 27.)

In addition to these clear and unmistakable passages we have another reason for considering a rightful betrothal tantamount to marriage, and that is by analogy from the parts of Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, in which the union of Christ and His Church is spoken of. We find throughout these passages that the terms "espoused" or "bride" and "wife" are used as synonyms and altogether indiscriminately. The great "mystery" concerning Christ and the Church (Eph. 5, 32) would lose its meaning if betrothal and marriage, as spoken of in the Word of God, were not identical. "For thy Maker is thy Husband; the Lord of Hosts is His name." (Is. 54, 5.) "Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land anymore be termed Desolate; but thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Beulah; for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married. For as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee; and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee." (Is. 62, 4. 5.) "Thus saith the Lord: I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals." (Jer. 2, 2.) "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord; for I am married unto you." (Jer. 3, 14.) Luther translates: "Ich will euch mir vertrauen"; the LXX: *κατακυριεύσω ὑμῶν*. "I will betroth thee unto Me forever; yea, I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies." (Hos. 2, 19.) "Come with Me from Lebanon,

My spouse." (Song of Solomon 4, 8—12.) "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom." (John 3, 29.) In connection with this passage it is worth while to study Luther's remarks, X, 754 ff., and III, 1095, §§ 182. 183. "And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." (Rev. 21, 2. 9.) Compare with these passages also the following: "The marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready" (Rev. 19, 7); "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church" (Eph. 5, 25); and the many statements in which lack of loyalty and faithlessness is compared to adultery.

In view of all these facts there can be but one conclusion: that the *Kirchenblatt* is wrong in its surmise that the regulations concerning betrothal in the Bible were binding upon the Jews only, just as Kliefoth (*op. cit.*, p. 18) merely states his own opinion when he writes: "Der gegenseitige Wille zweier Menschen, einander zu ehelichen, bildet nur das Verloebnis; aber das Verloebnis bildet nach christlicher und kirchlicher Anschauung eine Ehe erst dadurch, dass Gott sein Stiftungs- und Segenswort durch seine Kirche ueber die Verlobten spricht und an ihnen vollzieht." On the other hand, the sainted Dr. Graebner is undoubtedly correct, because standing on Scriptural ground, when he states: "A valid betrothal, the lawful and unconditional mutual consent of a marriageable man and a marriageable woman to be husband and wife, makes the parties to such compact essentially husband and wife before God." (THEOL. QUART., II, 350.) "The rescission of lawful espousals or valid betrothal is unlawful desertion from the marriage bond as truly as after the consummation of marriage." (III, 408.) "Valid betrothal is, *in foro ecclesiae*, essentially marriage." (IV, 458.)

St. Paul, Minn.

PAUL E. KRETZMANN.

SENECA AND NERO.

(Continued.)

The Emperor Claudius is uniformly by the ancient historians described as the awkward and blundering imbecile, who was a mere tool in the unscrupulous hands of his wives and his freedmen, Narcissus, Pallas, Polybius. The Senate, once so proud, cringed and crawled at the feet of Pallas, the former Greek slave (Pli., *Ep.*, 7, 29; 8, 6), who amassed an enormous fortune, and whose brother Felix, procurator of Palestine, we know from the Acts of the Apostles. The point of greatest vanity in the make-up of the emperor was his literary ambition and his scholarship. In this sphere the freedman Polybius was his chief secretary. Our exile of Corsica therefore adroitly seized the opportunity which presented itself to him: Seneca heard of the death of a brother of Polybius, and thereupon composed an essay of consolation inscribed to the powerful freedman. It is still in our hands. It abounds in beautiful embroidery of the Stoic commonplaces, it is humble, it is full of dexterous flattery, it often reminds us of Ovid at Tomi, but it does not seem to have accomplished its real purpose, *viz.*, the restoration of its author. Nay, even to the Empress Messalina he is said to have written a composition: to her, who was the chief cause of his exile, a piece of literature which, they say, he afterward suppressed. If he really did so, what must have been the abasement of that haughty mind, what, indeed, the hypocrisy of that keen intellect, in which psychological penetration was coupled with lofty principles of his sect.

The abrupt reversal of the brilliant exile's misfortunes came about through the catastrophe of the unspeakable Messalina. Her monstrous lust had reached a point where she was ready not merely to deceive her imperial spouse as she had done so often before, but even to stake her unbridled passions bound up with the contingency of destroying both the throne and the life of Claudius, if that should prove needful (Tacit., *Annals*, 11, 26). After her execution the imperial widower was promptly ensnared by his niece, the widow Agrippina,

daughter of Germanicus, great-niece of Tiberius and, above all, mother of a boy of eleven, Nero, about whose other names and paternity history now has none but an antiquarian concern. The temptation to unfold more explicitly the character and career of Nero is great, but I must limit myself in these readings. It is this curious and unique association which must be presented here, the most lofty and vigorous morality of the classic world as presented by Seneca: and the same Seneca first the educator of the future emperor and the tool of Agrippina's deep ambition; later the chief minister of state of the same, the literary mouthpiece and apologist of Nero's most indefensible crime, and, after some years of retirement and incessant devotion to noble letters, a victim of his own imperial pupil. All this is quite without parallel in the annals of our humankind.

It was Seneca whom Agrippina caused to be recalled from his Corsican exile (Tac., *Ann.* 12, 8) to take charge of her son's education. It was, as Tacitus puts it, a very popular measure to restore the leader of Roman culture to freedom and to Rome; it was still more cordially approved that the same foremost luminary should take charge of Nero's education, which, indeed, hitherto had been more than neglected. We may assume and presume as we may be inclined: records of that preceptor's activity and that influence there are none left us. We must be content here with the larger aspect of things. In 54, when the lad was in his seventeenth year, and Seneca some sixty-one, and the imperial imbecile Claudius in his sixty-fourth, the criminal ambition of Agrippina essayed the last, fearing that Claudius, after all, might place his own son Britannicus in the line of succession and not his adopted son Nero. It was at Sinuessa, to whose milder climate the imperial invalid had been removed. A poisoned mushroom was resorted to, and the Greek physician in Ordinary hastened the departure of Claudius, "being well aware that the greatest crimes were undertaken with danger, but accomplished with reward." (Tac., *Ann.* 12, 67.) On October 13, 54, Agrippina's son was swiftly transported from the Palatine to the

barracks of the Praetorian guard, whose commander, Burrus, must have been secured in advance, and there proclaimed emperor. Seneca and Burrus, for the next five years, were indeed the chief advisers of Nero; we may say that they were largely responsible, during that period, for the administration of the Roman Empire, to which, under Claudius, the greater part of Britain had been added, and which extended from the Euphrates to the Straits of Gibraltar. Did Seneca and Burrus equally know of the crime through which Agrippina had opened the way for her son? Did they consider this succession the smaller of evils? Were they aware that this succession meant for themselves high places and great power?

The new ministers at least, a thing rare in the association of power, as Tacitus says (*Ann.* 13, 2), acted in complete harmony. The funeral eulogy of the deceased emperor was delivered by the lad Nero, the new emperor. It was a brilliant and splendid performance, but every one knew that Seneca had written it (*ib.* 13, 3). And when the discourse dwelt on the deceased emperor's foresight and philosophical excellence, the distinguished audience found it difficult to maintain sober faces. Indeed, Seneca's imperial pupil had cultivated favorite tastes, which ran to other things than higher studies and serious oratory. His deepest fondness and strongest predilections were to emboss metal in sculptured forms, to paint, to sing, and to manage horses, and sometimes to try his hand at versification. We may at once say Seneca's loftier and wholesome principles never succeeded in endowing that mind with his own ideals, let alone with his own philosophy, while a passion for all things spectacular, and the vanity of an actor or singer, and an utter contentment with the surface of things, filled his soul. We cannot pass on without speaking of the bitter satire which Seneca composed on the death of Claudius, composed, we may fairly assume, about the same time when he wrote for the young emperor's lips the funeral eulogy, and soon after the wise and weighty state-paper with which the stripling opened

his public career in addressing the Senate. Did Seneca write his *Ludus de Morte Claudii* to gratify his deep feeling of revenge for his Corsican exile? Did he strive to please Agrippina? It is quite unthinkable that so pungent a pasquinade could be published so soon after the official mourning of the new court. At all events, it lies before us a historical document, the triumph of the brilliant author over the imperial imbecile, and a revelation of a soul whose philosophical tenets, then at least, had small room for forgiveness. It is a scene in heaven, where the hapless Claudius, after struggling some sixty-four years with his breath, appears before Jove. The general trend of that council seemed to be favorable to resolve upon the newcomer's deification, until Augustus arose to enter a protest, and to move that Claudius be banished from heaven in thirty days and from Olympus in three. This was adopted, and Mercury at once entrusted with the mandate to deliver him to the infernal regions. As the two passed over the Forum, Claudius beheld his own funeral pageant, and then for the first time realized that he was dead. In the lower world he felt quite at home; for he found there a large company of friends whom through the executioner he had sent before. Aeacus, the judge of souls departed, finds him guilty. One may be tempted to suggest that the minister and courtier produced this satire for the young emperor or even for the emperor's mother, Agrippina; but it is more likely that Seneca wrote it for himself, to gratify himself. After a year or so (55 A. D.) the philosopher, courtier, preceptor, and author composed, and probably published, an essay on *Clemency*, dedicated, and in a peculiar sense addressed as a political and administrative memoir, to his sovereign and imperial pupil. And we may fairly add that it was no less addressed to, and meant for, public opinion and that generation, to show the world what principles the minister sought to inculcate, what ideals to recommend to the practise of the ruler, and that a new and better era had dawned for mankind. And he sought also to stir in young Nero a lofty ambition to excel by noble

qualities, and to invite comparison with the most eminent administrators of the past. The spirit of this monitory essay is wholly admirable, and it abounds in suggestive and precious bits of historical illustration and parallels. Little doubt that, if Seneca's counsel and influence had moved and determined that reign for good, Nero would now be classed with the wiser and nobler emperors, such as Augustus, Trajan, Antoninus Pius, and the Stoic on the throne, Marcus Aurelius. We realize, too, from the very introduction, how, from the semirepublican ways of Augustus, things had been leading more and more towards the genuine autocracy and a despotism, but slightly, if at all, checked either by any political power inherent in Senate or people, or in any sentiment of inherited freedom. We are told indeed by Seneca (*Clem.* 11, 1) that on one occasion, when Burrus had presented to the young prince for his signature a paper ordering the execution of two highway robbers, Nero exclaimed, "Would that I could not write!" It was, at the threshold of his power, a mere mood of kindness. Later, when his monstrous and insatiable passions and appetites made sport of all human and divine law, and destroyed whoever stood in his path, the same Nero became the most cruel and blood-thirsty of tyrants. In this state-paper, by the by, the minister of the emperor by no means denies or masks his deeper Stoic convictions. What now in the young prince (*Clem.* 11, 2, 2) was mere nature and impulse must become deliberate judgment. Seneca does not shrink from condemning utterances of Caligula and Tiberius, though he names them not. Here, then, we see the philosopher-statesman at his best, and we are almost tempted to imagine him a kind of spiritual confessor as they were in the latter Christian times. But there is another side also, and we cannot find fault with some modern students (like Hicks in *Encycl. Britannica*, 11th ed.), who compare the man from Corduba with a Wolsey or Mazarin of modern history.

In a few years after Nero's accession his prime minister, the eminent Stoic Seneca, had become immensely rich. One

of his enemies, Suillius, charged in a public trial (Tac., *Ann.* 13, 42) that Seneca in four short years had amassed a fortune of 300 million sesterces, in our United States money \$13,200,000, which charge is repeated by Dio Cassius (61, 10), with insinuations of an adulterous intrigue with Agrippina herself; and while Seneca censured the luxury of the times, he himself possessed 500 tripods of citrus wood with ivory feet, the most expensive furniture then known. Dio is as bitter in his arraignment of Seneca as he is of Cicero, and probably equally unreliable in his dealings with either. Whether all this is true we know not. But one thing is obvious. It was felt by his contemporaries that the lofty morality and the severe postulates of his sect and of his writings chimed but ill with the superb prosperity of his public position. It is possible that young Nero in these earlier years lavished treasures upon him with reckless profusion. In his last years, when Seneca had retired from public life, he wrote, in that proud survey of his entire career, after 63 B. C., when he was a septuagenarian (*N. Quaest.*, IV, Praef. 18): "Add now a soul invincible by gifts, and amid so great a struggle of avarice a hand that never hollowed itself under pelf" (*like the freedmen under Claudius*); "add now also the frugality of my living, the restraint of my conversation, kindness in meeting the younger, respect in meeting the older: after this enquire of yourself whether you have spoken true or falsely. If it is true, you have been praised in the presence of a great witness; if false, you have become a laughing-stock."

But we must now take up the crime of crimes in Nero's life, a crime the dark shadow of which to some extent always also must cover the figure of the imperial counselor. It was in the fashionable season of the year 59. For some time the passions of Nero, who was then twenty-two years of age, had been directed toward Poppaea Sabina, the most beautiful woman of her day. It was easy for her imperial lover to remove her husband to be governor in Spain. But Poppaea insisted, in meeting the wooing of her imperial lover, on noth-

ing less than sharing the throne with him. But there were two obstacles, the emperor's wife Octavia and his mother Agrippina. The latter was the greater bar, for he knew that his very throne was her own creation, and he saw no way to remove her but death. The awful deed was at last accomplished on that gulf of Paradise, where Capri and the superb lines of Ischia, and the loveliness of the ridge of Posilipo mark the entrancing landscape. After long estrangement Nero had invited his mother to a banquet in his villa (Tac., *Ann.* 14, 4) between Misenum and Baiae. With histrionic faculty he had assumed there the cordial and filial tone of former years, and at the conclusion of the feast he had seen her embark on a superb barge of state, taking leave from her with kisses and embraces. The vessel departed down the coast; it was a night of perfect calm, and the placid gulf was unruffled, when the ceiling fell in which was vaulted over the dowager's cabin; a ceiling made heavy with lead fell down and destroyed the life of a courtier. Agrippina was protected and saved by the projecting edges of her sofa. The program of the plotted crime further failed in this, that the barge did not go to pieces at the critical moment, and though the barge was tilted over by the crew, Agrippina, only bruised on one shoulder by the blow of an oar, reached the shore by swimming, and immediately sought the seclusion of her own villa. She was to have been the victim of an accident, a shipwreck, which Nero would have duly deplored.

Her son was frantic at this issue (*ib.*, c. 7). He had summoned at once Burrus and Seneca, "one does not know," says Tacitus, "whether even before they were without knowledge of the matter." Imagine the situation of these counselors. The general plan of the imperial parricide was to present his mother as guilty of a plot on his life and his throne, and that Nero had acted entirely to prevent this. A long time the ministers sat in silence. Finally Seneca turned to the commander of the guards, and asked him whether the soldiers could be entrusted with the execution. But Burrus

refused to take that risk; he declared the praetorians would refuse to deal thus with a daughter of Germanicus. So Anicetus, who had devised the plot of the dissolving barge, undertook the consummation of the crime. Before the morning dawned, he, attended by some naval officers, dispatched Agrippina in her bedchamber with many blows. This, Nero said, was indeed the first day of his reign. Her remains were cremated the same night.

The courtiers congratulated him for having escaped his mother's murderous designs. This, generally, was the official manner everywhere; this was the burden of the report which Nero sent from Naples to the Senate. And again, if we accept Tacitus's account (*Ann.* 14, 11), it was Seneca whom the world censured, even more than Nero, for being once more the literary mouthpiece and the author of the emperor's apology. The obsequious Senate voted thanksgivings in the temples of the gods.

After this crisis in their lives, when Nero began to arrange his own life absolutely in conformity with his whims, his passions and appetites, after he had destroyed his own mother, who had stood in the way, it is obvious that Seneca's influence for good was at an end.

New York, N. Y.

E. G. SIHLER.

(*To be continued.*)

MODE OF BAPTISM.

In order to treat of the mode of Baptism intelligently, it is necessary to begin with the Old Testament. We would not expect to find the word baptism, or to baptize, βαπτίζειν, in the Hebrew Old Testament; the Mosaic rites of cleaning are denominated "purifications," and this word occurs occasionally in the New Testament.

That the word *baptism* is applicable to these Mosaic purifications is shown by Heb. 9, 9. 10: "Which [Tabernacle]

was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (*βαπτισμοῖς*), and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." So here we have the term *divers baptisms* associated with Mosaic regulations on meats and drinks and carnal ordinances in such a way that the reader is supposed to have well understood what was meant. They self-evidently consisted in "washings," as the word *βαπτισμοῖς* is very properly rendered in both the Authorized and the Revised Version. The Septuagint translation of the Old Testament (ca. 285 B. C.) renders these rites of cleaning, occurring mainly in the Pentateuch, *purifications*, *καθαρισμοὺς*, and the Jews of the time of Jesus used the word *baptism* for this term, as shown by the passage given, and which appears also from John 3, 23. 26: "There arose therefore a questioning on the part of John's disciples with a Jew about *purifying*, *περὶ καθαρισμοῦ*. And they came unto John and said unto him, Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou hast borne witness, behold, the same *baptizeth*, and all men come to Him." (Revised Version.) The matter in dispute related to "purification," to the relative value of Christ's and John's baptism. If Christ's baptism was by the Jews called a purification (washing), then the purifications of the Jews could be called and were called baptisms in a linguistic sense.

So we are fully justified in speaking of the *baptism* of various objects in the Old Testament—1) of the Levites, 2) of the priests, 3) of persons and things defiled, 4) of recovered lepers, and 5) of sacred objects.

1. Of the baptizing or purifying of the *Levites* we read Num. 8, 6. 7: "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel and *cleanse* them. And this shalt thou do unto them to *cleanse* them: *Sprinkle* the water of expiation on them," etc. This ceremonial cleansing was performed by sprinkling with prepared water. (Comp. Num. 19, 1—10.) In the water

thus used for ceremonial purification there was a figure of the water used in Holy Baptism, and the sprinkling harmonizes very nicely with our present mode of baptism, being symbolical of cleansing. I have before me a pamphlet published by a Baptist denomination, in which I see the heading: "The Symbolism of the Scriptures [meaning immersion] Is Meaningless without Immersion." We let the reader judge, and ask him to keep this thought before him as we go to other instances. We, of the Lutheran Church, do not emphasize the *symbolism* of the rite of Baptism, but we can safely say that the conception of *sprinkling* and *washing*, as indicative of ceremonial and *moral* cleansing, occurs far oftener in Holy Writ than that of *immersion*.

2. Of the "baptism" of *priests* we have an account Ex. 29, 14, 21: "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tent of meeting, and shalt wash them with water." This washing was of course *ceremonial*, not for the purpose of physical cleanliness. "And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him; and he shall be hallowed, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him." It will be found, on reading the entire section, that the official vestments, consisting of the coat, the robe of the ephod, and the breastplate, were put on, likely for the first time, after the baptismal or ceremonial washing and before the sprinkling with blood from the altar. Note that no reference is made to *immersion*, but that the *sprinkling* is again indicative of purifying.

3. The "baptizing" of *persons or things defiled* is mentioned Num. 19, 17—20. A dead body was a symbol of sin; contact with it meant defilement. The rite of purification was a "baptism" performed by sprinkling the person or thing with water duly prepared. This was one of the "divers washings," or baptisms, mentioned Heb. 9, 10, and by no means implies *immersion*.

4. "Baptism" of *recovered lepers* is spoken of Lev. 14, 7—9: "And he [the priest] shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean." (R. V.) Leprosy was one of the most expressive symbols of sin, and the purification from this defilement was a symbol of the removal of guilt. The mode of ceremonial cleansing strikingly resembles that of the defilement contracted by touching the dead. Sprinkling and washing—not immersion—are the methods enjoined.

It is also claimed that "proselyte Baptism, among the Jews, was administered to converts among the heathen on their admission to the Jewish Church; in the case of male subjects after their circumcision, and in the case of female subjects without any initiatory rite. It was administered also to the children of proselytes, equally with circumcision, and extended to those of both sexes." (*Theol. Medium*, Vol. III, p. 68.)

5. In regard to the *baptism of sacred objects* we refer to Lev. 16, 14—19. The mercy-seat and the altar were to be cleansed, or purified, by the sprinkling of blood on them and before them, in order to "cleanse and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel." In this section the priest is told four times to *sprinkle* of the blood, this *sprinkling* is symbolical of cleansing, not *immersion*. The idea of ceremonial cleansing (symbolical of spiritual cleansing in many instances) by *sprinkling* was familiar to the Jew; but to connect this idea with *immersion* must have been novel and strange to him. And yet we are told: "The symbolism of the Scriptures is meaningless without immersion."

In the light of what has been said, let us turn to the Greek terms βαπτίζω and βάπτω.

The latter word occurs in the New Testament but four times, *without any reference to Baptism*, in Matt. 26, 23; Luke 16, 24; John 13, 26; and Rev. 19, 13. In these instances it is translated by the word *dip*; in Rev. 19 the Revised Version has "sprinkle with."

Speaking of the word βαπτίζω, we find in Liddel & Scott's unabridged Greek lexicon that, while he gives as first meaning "to dip" and as second "to draw wine by dipping," he, in third place, recognizes a distinct meaning for New Testament usage, viz., "to baptize," giving a number of instances, and letting the reader form his own conclusions as to the *mode*.

Right here we point to the glaring inconsistency of Baptists, who limit *baptizo* to its *first* meaning and always harp on that, while, for instance, in English they cannot but admit that a word may have half a dozen meanings, each of which is in place in its proper connection. Says a writer: "But to multiply words on a point so plain would be needless, had not so much stress been laid on the supposed original meaning of this word (*baptizo*). It is, therefore, too plain to be denied that words do often so far depart from their primitive meaning as entirely to leave the original idea, and that the secondary senses of a word are often by far the most numerous and important."

What the writer says we all know to be true. By way of illustration take the word "prevent." Its first and original meaning (according to its Latin derivative), as used in the Authorized Version, is "to come before, act in advance of" (*Standard Dictionary*), and appears in such passages as, "When Peter was come into the house, Jesus *prevented* him" (*i. e.*, accosted him first), Matt. 17, 25. Again, "Thou *preventest* him with the blessings of goodness" (*i. e.*, by sending the blessings before the desire is expressed), Ps. 21, 3. To express this obsolete sense of prevent we now use such words as "anticipate" or "forestall." How ungrammatical, yea, how silly it would be to insist on the original meaning of "prevent," to the exclusion of all others; and yet, this is what the Baptists do, and want us to do, with the word "baptize." We could follow the same line of argument with the words "conversation," "charity," and others, when looking to their meaning in the Authorized Version and at the present time.

Let us look to a few instances of the use of the verb *to baptize* (βαπτίζειν) in the New Testament.

Mark 6, 4 we read: "And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing (βαπτισμούς, the baptisms) of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables" (or couches, κλινῶν). Dr. Woods says: "The *baptism*, or ceremonial purification, of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and couches was, doubtless, performed in different ways. Cups and pots and brazen vessels might, possibly, be immersed all over in water, though this is not probable. But to suppose that beds or couches were immersed in the same way, would be unreasonable, especially since the prescribed modes of ceremonial purification, and indeed the most common mode, was the *sprinkling of consecrated water*." This plainly shows that in the New Testament the word *baptizo* simply implies the application of water, without reference to the mode of application. In that same connection, Mark 7, 4, it reads: "And when they [the Pharisees] come from the market, excepting they *wash*" (literally, "baptize themselves," βαπτίζονται), "they eat not." Would any Baptist seriously contend that the Pharisees *immersed* on each of these occasions? Their houses offered no facilities for this, nor were the Mosaic instructions to that effect, as we have shown. The Revised Version has the reading: "Except they bathe themselves." In the same verse they translate the word *baptismous* with *washings*. The word *bathe* to-day seldom implies *total* immersion. We speak of *towel-baths*, where the conception of immersion is excluded, and even in the tub-bath the head is seldom wholly immersed.

Another instance. The "baptism" of the Israelites when crossing the Red Sea was by *sprinkling* and not immersion. 1 Cor. 10, 2 it reads in both the Authorized and the Revised Version: "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Paul does not speak of the Sacrament of Baptism, but merely of the application of water. Were the Israelites immersed? Wm. Campbell's New Testament, as well as the

Baptist construction, has it: "And were all *immersed* into Moses in the cloud and in the sea," which contradicts history, and is an imposition on the intelligence of the public. Moses says in so many words: "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea *upon the dry ground*; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left." (Ex. 14, 22. R. V.) The Egyptians, who followed, were "immersed." Of the Israelites the apostle says in that connection: "Our fathers were all under the cloud." (1 Cor. 10, 1. R. V.) This clearly indicates the mode of their baptism.

We find *baptism* mentioned 1 Pet. 3, 20. 21: "Who before time were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water; which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even Baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Some think that baptism in this connection is closely allied in thought with immersion. We fail to see that connection. Neither the ark nor those in it were immersed; in fact, immersion, or submersion, meant death to the wicked of that day. It reminds us of the Egyptians in the Red Sea. Those in the ark were saved "through water," because the water *bore the ark aloft*, while the water *submerged* those who perished.

Some think that baptism is symbolical of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and they appeal to Rom. 6, 3—5 and Col. 3, 11. 12. "Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into death." "Buried with Him by Baptism." Let us see. If *burial* is to be a symbol of *Baptism*, then it ought to read, Buried *into water*, not, *into Christ*. Our Baptist friends do not pretend to immerse into Christ, but into water. Again, Christ's burial was not a subterranean immersion, so to speak. His body was placed in a tomb hewn out of a rock, practically *above ground*. The fact is, the apostle in these passages is not teaching or speaking of the mode of baptism, but

wishes to inculcate the great truth that, as Christ died for our sins and rose again for our justification, so we through Baptism should be dead to sin (the buried are considered dead) and rise again to a new spiritual life. Read the connection, and you will find this to be true. Let us emphasize once more that the Bible throughout prefers sprinkling to immersion as a symbol of cleansing. Is. 52, 15 it is predicted of the Messiah: "So shall He sprinkle many nations"; and Ezek. 36, 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." In Joel 2, 28 *pouring*, not immersion, is the figure employed: "I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh." This had its fulfilment on the day of Pentecost. Of this day the Lord told His disciples: "Ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost." (Acts 1, 5.) On this occasion they were not *immersed* in the Holy Ghost, but He "sat on each of them" (Acts 2, 3).

We could turn to the instances of baptisms in the New Testament, and show that sprinkling or pouring was the *likely* mode. (Cf. Acts 2, 41; 10, 44—48; 16, 32—35; 8, 38. On the mode of John's baptism compare Acts 1, 5.)

Incidentally we call attention to the different modes of immersion. Some submersionists hold that a single plunge under water suffices; others, like the Greek Church, contend that trine immersion is absolutely necessary. The Dunkards insist on an entire triple immersion by a forward motion of the subject; but Rev. Campbell, the founder of the "Christian" denomination, says: "We must dip only once, and the motion must be backwards." Mormons immerse the living for the benefit of their dead friends.

We do not claim to have exhausted the subject, but put our remarks down in writing by request. A. W. MEYER.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

OF ETERNAL LIFE.

John 17, 24: *Father, I will that they also whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am; that they may behold My glory which Thou hast given Me.*

John 17 comprises the high-priestly prayer of Christ. It was uttered previous to the journey to the Garden of Gethsemane, in the presence of the eleven disciples, Judas having left the company to carry out his dark design of betraying his Master. In this intercessory prayer Christ views His work of redemption as an accomplished fact. "I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do," He says v. 4. On the basis of this finished work He prays.

An analysis of the prayer reveals three distinct parts: Christ prays for Himself (vv. 1—5); for His disciples (vv. 6—19); for all who through the apostles' word—His Word—shall believe on Him (vv. 20—26).

In v. 24 the intercession reaches its culmination point. "*Father, Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world,*" v. 24. Thou art a "righteous Father" (v. 25); I am Thy beloved Son, and as Thy Son, to whom Thou hast made promises, I express My just demands: "*Father, I will,*" *θέλω*, I demand. What is it that He wills? "*That they be with Me where I am,*" in life eternal. Who are they that are to participate in this blessedness? "*They whom Thou hast given Me.*" "I have manifested Thy name unto the men which Thou gavest Me out of the world. Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me; and they have kept Thy Word" (v. 6). These "*I will that they be with Me where I am*"; they have received Thy words, "and have known surely that I came out from Thee; and they have believed that Thou didst send Me"

(v. 8). These, and all these that believe on Me, the entire body of believers, the Holy Christian Church on earth, with regard to these *"I will that they be with Me where I am."* In the decree of foreordination Thou hast given them to Me as the fruit of My labors; Thou hast promised that I "shall see of the travail of My soul, and shall be satisfied" (Is. 53, 11); Thou hast said: "Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance" (Ps. 2, 8); and now with regard to these, and *all* these that believe on Me through Thy Word, *"I will that they be with Me where I am,"* and, being with Me, *"that they may behold My glory,"* the glory that belongs to Me, *"which Thou hast given Me."* "My glory," My divine majesty, communicated to My human nature, the fulness of the Godhead that dwells in Me bodily, and glimpses of which I now and then vouchsafed My disciples to behold (John 1, 14) in My state of humiliation,—I will *that they shall behold* uninterruptedly, wonderingly, and admiringly.—

Being with the Lord (2 Cor. 5, 8), enjoying His presence, beholding His glory, seeing Him "as He is,"—this is the principal constituent part of heavenly glory.

But what a consoling "I will" this is! The Christian in death's last struggle looks up to his Savior in faith, knowing that this "I will" of the Savior's intercessory prayer embraces him also, and that he, the servant, will be where the Master is, according to His promise: "Where I am, there shall also My servant be." (John 12, 26.)

Rom. 8, 18: *I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.*

In the preceding section Paul had spoken of the afflictions that befall Christians. He had shown the necessity of conformity to Christ in suffering. Christians must undergo the refining process of tribulation. (1 Pet. 1, 6. 7.) "If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glori-

fied," so says the apostle v. 17. Christians should suffer willingly, gladly, with Christ; it is a mark of their Christianity, not a ground for their participation of Christ's glory. But it is a hard lesson to learn; hence Christians need encouragement, consolation, under the cross. The passage before us is one for cross-bearers.

"*I reckon,*" λογίζομαι, I conclude, says Paul. He has made calculations, has weighed certain things in the balance, and now renders his judgment. He has placed "*the sufferings of this present time*" on the one scale, and on the other "*the glory which shall be revealed in us,*" and his verdict is: no comparison possible between the two. And Paul, let us remember, knows by experience whereof he speaks. (Read 2 Cor. 11, 16 ff.) Christians must suffer; true, that is the *via dolorosa* along which they must wander. Like master, like subject. "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me." (Matt. 16, 24.) But though they are "*sufferings*" that smart and burn, they are but temporary, sufferings "*of this present time.*" Καρπός is a fixed time, or season, and but of short duration; hence the sufferings of *this time* are comparatively insignificant, they last but for a season. That is one consolation. (1 Pet. 1, 6.) But the principal consolation is this: "*the glory to be revealed in us,* which is certain and near, is eternal. Set over against the coming glory, the sufferings of this time, this short life, dwindle into insignificance. The sufferings of this present time are "*not worthy of,*" οὐκ ἄξια, are not of like weight with, the coming glory, are not weighty in comparison with the glory to be revealed. "As the glory so outweighs the suffering, the idea of merit, whether of condignity or of congruity, is of necessity excluded. It is altogether foreign to the context. For it is not the ground on which eternal life is bestowed, but the greatness of the glory that the saints are to inherit, which the apostle designs to illustrate." (Hodge.)

This glory is ours now already by faith; as yet it is hidden (1 John 3, 2); but one day, the last day, it shall be

revealed in us; we Christians shall be glorified with Christ. Sursum corda!

John 3, 16: *For God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*

This text has been fitly called "the Gospel in a nutshell." It is needless to give its setting. Everybody knows that these words were spoken by Christ to Nicodemus, who needed instruction on the way to life.

Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον = "*For so loved God the world,*" the original Greek reads, throwing emphasis on every word, and thus manifesting the profundity of God's love to the world. Οὕτως = *So greatly, so deeply, so intensely* God loved. The fact that God at all loved the world is *remarkable*. This thought is brought out by the position of the verb "loved," it being placed before the subject: *so loved God*. Remarkable, indeed, this love; for what is the object of God's love? "*So loved God the world,*" τὸν κόσμον, *i. e.*, fallen, sinful mankind. What a contrast! God and the world! The holy God loved this unholy world! Love longs for union and communion with the object of its love. God loved the world! He hates sin, but He loves the sinner. This world, sinful mankind, had rebelled and deserved to die, "to perish." (John 6, 33.) But God willed not its death. "*Not perish, but have everlasting life*"—this was and is His earnest, sincere, gracious will towards the rebelling world. To carry it out, the world must be redeemed from sin, and so "*He gave His only-begotten Son*" into suffering and death. The Son "tasted death for every man" (Heb. 2, 9); He "died for all" (2 Cor. 5, 15); "He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2, 2). Thus God manifested His love towards the world, and the fact that it was His *only-begotten* Son (John 1, 14) shows the depth of the love of God still more. This was a free and unmerited gift; nothing impelled God to do it but His great love. Sin being atoned for, God's love and justice could be reconciled. God's justice demanded: "The world" must "perish"; His love

said: The world shall have "everlasting life," and so He gave His Son. Now there is a way of escape from perdition. Which? "*Whosoever believeth in Him shall have everlasting life.*"

John 3, 36: *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*

"*The wrath of God abideth on him*" that believeth not the Son. Man, as he is by nature, is under the wrath of God (Eph. 2, 3), and this wrath *abideth*, continues to remain, on him so long as he is without Christ. Oh, miserable condition of him who believeth not the Son! There is but one way of escaping this wrath, but one way of obtaining everlasting life,—by believing the Son. This truth, all-important, is set forth both positively and negatively.

Now, what does "*to believe on the Son*" say and imply? It implies that you are unable to appease God, that so far as you are concerned the wrath of God for sin must abide on you forever; it furthermore implies that the Son has effected a removal of God's wrath, has brought about a reconciliation with God for man, so that now there is an open sesame to everlasting life; to believe on the Son says that you rest your heart's confidence in Him, on what He has done for you, as upon an impregnable rock, where you are safe from the wrath of God. To believe on the Son says that your faith has a firm foundation to stand on, forgiveness of sin is yours; and where there is forgiveness of sin, there is life everlasting; and of this life eternal you *now* already have a foretaste, for "*he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life,*" the full fruition thereof to come in the life hereafter.

The passage before us says emphatically: There is salvation in one name, one name, and one alone—the Son, Jesus, the Savior.

The second part of the text enforces the truth of the first. "*He that believeth not the Son,*" *i. e.*, he that does not believe what the Son says, what He teaches in reference to His redemptive work, "*shall not see life.*" No other faith can save. One

may, for instance, loudly proclaim that Christ is the Great Teacher, or that He is the highest moral example to follow, etc., —all such faith cannot save. But one faith saves, faith in Christ, the Savior from sin. Where this faith is wanting, man is under God's wrath, "*the wrath of God abideth on him.*" (Eph. 2, 3.)

(To be continued.)

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

FOUR CONFESSIONS OF THE ANCIENT WALLENSIAN CHURCH.

A. D. 1100, 1120, 1176, 1542.

Compiled from Geo. Faber's *History and Theology of the Wallensian Church* (London, 1838), by REV. FRANZ L. BRAUN, German Lutheran pastor emeritus and late French Lutheran Mission pastor among the Vaudois at Chicago.

I. CONFESSION OF LOMBERS, NEAR ALBI, FRANCE.

At the Council of Lombers, near Albi, County of Albige, Provence, South France, 1176, where the Albigenes were accused of Manicheism, a doctrine already condemned by an ecumenical council, the defendants confessed as follows:—

"Hear ye, good men, our faith which we confess; for we now confess it through love for you and for your sakes."

Then the president of the council, Bishop Gerard of Albi, answered: "You speak, it seems, not for the love of God, but for the sake of the people."

Whereupon they confessed as follows:—

"We believe in one God, three and one: The Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost.

"Also we believe that the Son of God took our flesh upon Him; was baptized in Jordan, fasted in the wilderness; preached our salvation; suffered and died and was buried; descended into hell; rose again on the third day; ascended into heaven; sent, on the day of Pentecost, the Spirit, the Paraclete; and will come again, in the day of Judgment, to judge the quick and the dead, when all will rise again.

"We acknowledge likewise that what we believe with the heart we must confess with the mouth.

"We believe that he who eateth not the body of Christ is not in a state of salvation; and that the body of Christ is not duly consecrated, save in the Church and by a priest, whether that priest be good or bad; and that the consecration is performed not more effectually by a good priest than by an evil one.

"And we believe that a person is not in a state of salvation unless he has been baptized; and that infants through Baptism are placed in the state of salvation.

"We believe likewise that man and woman are in a state of salvation though they be carnally joined into marriage; and that every one receives penitence, both in mouth and in heart, from a priest; and that he ought to be baptized in the church.

"If anything more than these articles can be shown to us through the Gospels or the Epistles, we are prepared to believe and to confess it." (Cf. *History and Theology of Ancient Vallenses and Albigenses*, by Geo. Stanley Faber, London, 1838, pp. 234. 235.)

In the year 1658, Sir Samuel Morland brought from Piedmont to England several manuscripts which purported to be works of the ancient Vaudois of the Cottian Alps. Those he deposited in the University library at Cambridge, whence most of them have disappeared.

Among them may be specially noticed, 1) a confession of faith, 2) a catechism, 3) a treatise about Antichrist, and 4) a poem denominated *The Noble Lesson*. Of these the confession of faith was composed after the Reformation, and also the catechism, and published 1618. — The treatise upon Antichrist may have been composed not later than 1160, and of *The Noble Lesson* (whose manuscript at the library at Cambridge was lost, while an older one, an undefiled copy, was found at the library at Geneva, Switzerland) no date is given, but judging from the language, its origin dates back at least to 1120.

II. THE TREATISE ON ANTICHRIST.

“Antichrist is the falsehood of eternal damnation, covered with the appearance of truth and righteousness of Christ and His spouse. The iniquity of such a system is with all his ministers, great and small; and inasmuch as they follow the law of our evil and blinded heart, such a congregation is called *Antichrist of Babylon, of the fourth beast, of the harlot, of the man of sin, who is the son of perdition.*

“His first work is that the service of latria, properly due to God alone, he perverts into that of Antichrist himself and to his doings; to the poor creature, rational or irrational, sensible or insensible; to man, for instance, male or female saints that departed this life; and to their images or carcasses or relics. His doings are the sacraments, especially that of the Eucharist, which he worships equally with God and Christ, prohibiting the adoration of God alone.

“His second work is that he robs and deprives sinners of the merits of Christ, with the whole sufficiency of grace, and justification, and regeneration, and remission of sins, and sanctification, and confirmation, and spiritual nourishments, and imputes and attributes them to his own authority, or to a form of words, or to his own performance, or to the saints or their intercession, or to the fire of purgatory. Thus does he divide the people from Christ and lead them away to the things already mentioned, that so they may not seek the things of Christ or through Christ, but only the works of their own hands; and not through a living faith in God and Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, but through the will and the works of the Antichrist, agreeably to his preaching that man’s salvation depends upon his own deeds.

“His third work is that he attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit to a dead, outward faith, baptizing children in that faith, and teaching that, by the mere work of the outward consecration of baptism, regeneration may be procured.

“His fourth work is that he rests the whole religion of

the people upon his Mass; forbidding them to hear it, he deprives them of spiritual and sacramental manducation.

"His fifth work is that he does everything to be seen, and to glut his insatiable avarice.

"His sixth work is that he allows of manifest sins, without ecclesiastical censure.

"His seventh work is that he defends his unity not by the Holy Spirit, but by the secular power.

"His eighth work is that he hates, and persecutes, and searches after, and robs, and destroys the members of Christ.

"These things and many others are the cloak and vestment of Antichrist, by which he covers his lying wickedness, lest he should be rejected as a pagan. But there is no other cause of idolatry than a false opinion of grace, and truth, and authority, and invocation, and intercession, which this Antichrist has taken away from God, and which he has ascribed to ceremonies, and authorities, and a man's own works, and saints, and purgatory.

"As for Antichrist himself, he has already, by God's permission, long reigned in the Church." (Cf. regarding the Treatise on Antichrist: G. Faber, *History and Theology of Ancient Vallenses and Albigenses*, 1838, pp. 379—385.)

III. NOBLE LESSON.

(Extract.)

"O brethren, hear a noble lesson!

"We ought always to watch and pray, for we see that the world is near to its end. We ought to strive to do good works since we see that the world approaches to its termination.

"A thousand and a hundred years have been entirely completed since it was written that we are in the last times.

"We ought to covet little; for we are at what remains. Daily we see the signs coming to their accomplishment in the increase of evil and in the decrease of good. These are the perils which the Scripture speaks of, which the Gospels have recounted, and which St. Paul mentions: that no man who lives can know the end. Therefore ought we more to fear,

since we are not certain whether death will overtake us to-day or to-morrow. But when the day of Judgment shall come, every one shall receive his entire payment, both those who have done ill, and those who have done well. For the Scripture saith, and we ought to believe it, that all men shall pass two ways, the good to glory, the wicked to torment. But if one shall not believe this dispartition, let him attend to Scripture from the end to the commencement. Since Adam was formed down to the present time, there may he find, if he will give his intention to it, that a few are saved in comparison with those that remain.

“Wherefore, whosoever wishes to do good works, he ought to begin with paying honor to God. He ought likewise to call upon His glorious Son, the dear Son of holy Mary, and also upon the Holy Ghost, who gives unto us a good way. These three, the Holy Trinity, being one God, ought to be invocated, full of power and all wisdom and all goodness.

“This we ought often to pray for and request, that He would give us fortitude to encounter the enemies, and that we may conquer them before our end, to wit, the world, the devil, and the flesh; and that He would give us wisdom, accompanied with goodness, so that we may know the way of truth, and keep pure the soul which God has given us, both the soul and the body in the way of charity.

“As we love the whole Trinity, so likewise ought we to love our neighbor, for God has commanded it: not only those who do good to us, but likewise those who do us evil. We ought, moreover, to have a firm hope in the celestial King, that, in the end, He will lodge us in His glorious hostelry.

“Now he who shall not do what is contained in this Lesson shall not enter into the holy house; though the saying be hard to be received by the caitiff race, who love gold and silver, who depreciate the promises of God, who neither keep His laws nor His commandments, and who suffer not good people to keep them, but rather hinder them according to their power.

“How did this evil enter among mankind? Because Adam sinned from the beginning by eating of the forbidden apple, and to others germinated the grain of the evil seed. He gained death to himself, and to others who followed him. Well may we say that this was an evil morsel. But Christ hath redeemed the good from this passion.

“Now we find in the Lesson that Adam misbelieved God, his Creator. And we may see likewise that those now become still worse who abandon God the Father Almighty, and who believe in idols to their own destruction.” —

“Then God sent the angel to a noble virgin of the lineage of the King, sweetly saluting her; for she was separated unto the law. Afterwards he went on to say unto her: ‘Fear not, Mary, for the Holy Ghost shall be in thy companionship, and thou shalt bear a son whom thou shalt call Jesus; He shall deliver His people wherein they have offended.’ Nine months the glorious virgin had Him in her womb, but that she might not be reprehended, she was espoused to Joseph. Pure was Our Lady, and Joseph also. But this we ought to believe, for the Gospel has said it, that they put the Child in the manger when He was born, and enveloped Him in rags, and poorly lodged Him. Here may repent the covetous and the avaricious, who will never cease to amass riches.

“Many miracles were done when the Lord was born, for God sent the angels to announce it to the shepherds; and in the East appeared a star to the three men; glory also was given unto God in heaven, and on earth peace unto the good.

“Afterward the Little One suffered persecution; but the Child grew in grace and in age and in divine wisdom, wherein He was instructed.

“He called the twelve apostles. Rightly are they so named; and He would change the law which He had before given. Yet He changed it not that it might be abandoned, but He renewed it that it might be better kept. He received baptism to give salvation, and He said to the apostles that they should baptize all nations, for they began the renovation.

The ancient Law well forbade fornication and adultery; but the new Law forbids to look and to lust. The ancient Law annulled matrimony, and permitted a bill of divorce should be given; but the new Law forbids to take her that is put away, and says that they should not be parted whom God has joined. The ancient Law cursed the womb which bears not fruit; the new Law counsels to keep virginity. The ancient Law forbade only perjury; the new Law says: Swear not at all, and let thy speech be only yea and no. The old Law commanded to fight against enemies and to render evil for evil; but the new Law says: Avenge not thyself, but leave vengeance to the holy King, and let those live in peace who do unto thee injury, and thou shalt find pardon from the heavenly King. The old Law said: Thou shalt love thy friends, and thou shalt hate thy enemies; but the new Law says: Thou shalt do so not any more, but love your enemies, and do good to them that injure you, and pray for them that persecute you and for them that seek an occasion against you, that you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven. The old Law commanded to punish malefactors; but the new Law says: Pardon all mankind, and thou shalt find pardon from the Father Almighty; for if thou pardonest not, thou shalt not find salvation. None ought to kill or to hate any person, nor ought we to scoff at the simple and the poor, nor to hold as vile the stranger who comes from another country; for in this world we are all pilgrims. Thus ought all we who are brethren to serve God. This is the new Law which Jesus Christ has said that we ought to keep.

“The apostles were so strong in the fear of the Lord, as also both the men and the women that were with them, that for these things they ceased not either their doings or their sayings; for many of them were determined to have Jesus Christ. Great were the torments according to what is written, only because they showed the way of Jesus Christ. But as for those that persecuted them, it was not so much for them to hold to the bad, because they had not the faith of our Lord

Jesus Christ, like those who take now occasion, and who persecute so much, who ought to be Christians, but whose semblance is evil. Yet in this they ought to be reprehended, because they persecute and imprison the good; for in no lesson it is found that the saints persecuted or imprisoned any one. Now after the apostles were certain teachers, they showed the way of Jesus Christ, the Savior. And these are found even to the present time, but they are manifest to only a few people. These people wish to show the way to Jesus Christ, but they are so persecuted that they can do but little. So many are false Christians blended with error, and more than all the other those who are their pastors. For they persecute and hate those who are better than themselves, and let those live quietly who are false deceivers. But by this we know that they are not good pastors, because they love not the flock, save for their fleece. Yet the Scripture says, and we may see it, that, if a person loves those that are good, he will wish to love God and fear Jesus Christ, and that he will neither curse, nor swear, nor lie, nor commit adultery, nor kill or defraud his neighbor, nor revenge himself upon his enemies. Nevertheless, they say that such a person is a *Vaudes* and is worthy of punishment; and they find occasion, through lies and deceit, to take from him that which he has gotten by his just labor. But he who is thus persecuted strengthens himself greatly through the fear of the Lord; for the kingdom of heaven shall be given to him at the end of the world. Then shall he have great glory in the place of such dishonor.

“But in this is greatly manifested their malice, that these who will curse, and lie, and swear, and put out money to usury, and kill, and commit adultery, and revenge themselves upon those who do evil to them, are said and reckoned to be good and loyal men. Yet let such a person take heed that he may be not deceived at the end, when his mortal malady comes, when death seizes upon him, and when he is scarcely able to speak. Then he calls for a priest and wishes to confess himself. But, according to the Scripture, he has delayed too long; for

it commands and says, that thou shouldest confess while in sound mind, and not wait to the last. The priest demands if he has any sins. Two or three words he answers, and he has soon finished. The priest tells him that he cannot be forgiven if he does not restore all that he has taken from another, and well examine his sins. When he hears this, he has great trouble, and he thinks within himself, if he shall restore it entirely, what will remain to his children, and what will the world say? Then he commands his children to examine their faults, and gives money to the priest that he himself may receive absolution. Though he has extorted from another one hundred pounds or perhaps two, yet the priest will pardon him for a hundred pence, sometimes for less, when he can get no more. And he tells him a long story, and promises him pardon; for he will say Mass both for him and his forefathers. Thus grants he pardon to them, whether they be just or felonious, and he puts his hands upon their heads. But when he leaves them, he occasions a grand festival; for he makes them to understand that they have been very well absolved. Yet ill are they confessed who are thus faulty; and they will certainly be deceived by such an absolution, and he who makes them believe it sins mortally. For I dare to say, and it will be found very true, that all the popes, from Sylvester down to the present one, and all the cardinals, and all the bishops, and all the abbots, even all such put together, have no power to absolve or to pardon a single creature in regard to a single mortal sin, inasmuch as God alone pardons, and no other can do it.

“But those who are pastors ought to do this. They ought to preach to the people, and pray with them, and often feed them with divine doctrine, and chastise sinners, giving unto them discipline. That is to say, they ought to admonish them to repentance, so that they should confess their sins without fail, that they should repent in this present life, that they should fast and give alms and pray fervently; for by these things the soul finds salvation.

“Wherefore we Christians, unworthy of the name of Christians, who have sinned, and who have abandoned the Law of Jesus Christ (for we have neither fear nor faith nor charity), ought to confess our sins without delay, amending ourselves with weeping and penitence in respect to the offenses which we have done through three mortal sins, namely, the lust of eyes, the lust of flesh, and the pride of life, through which we have done ill. This way we must keep. If we will love and follow Christ, we must have spiritual poverty of heart, and love chastity, and serve God humbly so we may follow the way of Jesus, and so we may overcome our enemies.

“We have only to imitate Jesus Christ, and to do His pleasure, and to keep firmly that which He has commanded, and to be well advised when Antichrist shall come that we may give no credence either to his things or to his sayings. But according to Scripture there are many antichrists, for all who are contrary to Christ are antichrists.

“Many signs and great wonders shall be, from this time forward, to the day of Judgment. The heaven and the earth shall burn, and all the living shall die. Then all shall rise again to life everlasting. Every building shall be laid prostrate, and there shall be the Last Judgment, when God shall separate His people, according as it is written. Then shall He say to the wicked: ‘Depart from Me, ye accursed, into the infernal fire, which shall have no end.’ There shall they be straitened by their grievous conditions, namely, by a multitude of pains and by sharp torment and by irreversible damnation.

“From this may God deliver us, if it be His pleasure; and may He give us to hear that which He will say to His people without delay, when He shall say: ‘Come unto Me, ye blessed of My Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world.’ In that place you shall have delight and riches and honor.

“May it please the Lord, who formed the world, that we may be of the numbers of His elect, to stand in his courts. Thanks unto God! Amen.” (Cf. G. Faber, *l. c.*, pp. 399—416.)

The "Treatise on Antichrist" (1160) and the "Noble Lesson" (1120) are confessions of the original Waldenses in the Cottian Alps, and the Confession of Lombers (1176) of the Cathares, or Albigenses, in France, descendants of the Alpine Waldenses, proper and unmixed.

The traveling agents of Peter Waldus at Lyons, 1160 (better known as Poor Men, Beggars, Begharden in Holland, Picards in Germany and Bohemia), who had twice applied to the pope for the privilege to preach, and who called their converts Waldensians after their lord, Peter Waldus, were at the time of the Council at Lombers still in favor of the papal Church, but the Cathares (Albigenses), or descendants of the original Alpine Waldensians, the defendants, were banned even before 1154. Those were they who confessed before the council.

Even the Catholic bishop of Turin, Claude Seyssel, about 1500, admits: "They" (the Waldensians) "lead a purer life than other Christians except by compulsion; they swear not, and they rarely take the name of God in vain. They fulfil their promises with all good faith, and are living for the most part in poverty; they protest that they alone preserve the apostolical life and doctrines. On this account they assert that the power of the Church resides with themselves, as being the innocent and true disciples of Christ, for whose faith and religion to live in poverty and to suffer persecution from us they esteem honorable and glorious." (Cf. Faber, *l. c.*, p. 432.)

(To be concluded.)

MISCELLANIES.

IN THE QUINCY DAILY HERALD for January 16, 1915, there appeared the following:—

The Parents' and Teachers' Association of Franklin School held its regular meeting last evening in the assembly hall of the school. The principal feature of the meeting was an address by Rev. Theodore Walz, pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church.

VIEWS OF REV. WALZ.

The address of Rev. Walz is given in detail because it touches a question of vital importance to all persons interested in the public schools. The following are the Lutheran pastor's views as expressed last night:—

"I am with you this evening to talk to you on the subject of 'Religion and the Public Schools.' The subject is a vast one, one that cannot be covered in a brief address. Fortunately, that is not my duty this evening, but I am simply to have a heart-to-heart talk to you on this matter.

"Lutherans, the Evangelical Churches, and the Roman Catholics maintain parochial schools. The Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church has over 1,000 teachers and 100,000 scholars. Many people are under the impression that Lutherans maintain their schools merely for the perpetuation of the German language. This is a mistake. It is true, Lutherans prize the German language highly, the language of Luther. It stands second to none. Even Longfellow acknowledged that. And its magnificent literature is the pride of the Germans, as its scholars are among the best teachers and thinkers of the world. But to maintain a school for the simple reason of propagating a language is outside a Christian congregation's sphere of action.

"There are others who seem to believe that Lutherans maintain parish schools out of antagonism to the public schools. Wrong again! Why, after confirmation many of our Lutheran children go to the public school. That does not show a spirit of antagonism, does it?

"Let me add: It is not the duty of the parochial school to compete in all things with the public school. No; its position is, and should be, this: First and foremost religion! I say, this first of all; but if, when this is attained, pupils of the Lutheran parochial schools still can well get along in the high school, all honor to the teachers! They have done more than their duty.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SPLENDID WORK.

"What is the attitude of Lutherans over against the public schools? We believe that the public schools are necessary institutions, doing splendid work. We are not blind to the fact that prominent men and women are exerting wholesome influence to enhance the efficiency of the public school. We cheerfully pay taxes for its maintenance. But our praise and appreciation of the public schools must and does cease at once, and we are compelled to antagonize them, when they make attempt to do that which the Constitution of our country and the State law forbid—the imparting of religious in-

struction to the children. Our public schools must be entirely non-religious. The education they are to give is one of the intellect, but not of the heart; they are to feed the head, but not the soul.

"How did that come about? Let us trace it briefly. You know that the whole common school system, as we have it everywhere to-day, is due to Luther's Reformation,—to Luther. Luther's Reformation firmly established a system of common schools for imparting religious instruction to the children. Now, wherever the influence of the Reformation went, with it went that religious school system. The Colonial Lutherans established religious schools here immediately after they had erected a church. I remind you of the Salzburger, in Georgia, 1734. The Puritans, 1620, did the same. We hear so much of the three R's to-day. The original is the four R's, reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic, and religion. Why, for a long time the only textbooks from which to learn to read were the Bible and the catechism. But I must make a long story short. As time went on, we severed our connection with the mother country, a new Constitution was adopted, and one of its jewels is the First Amendment, granting complete separation of Church and State. This principle involves that religious instruction must be barred from the public schools.

CHURCH AND STATE SEPARATE.

"That Church and State shall be and remain separate, that civil authority shall have no jurisdiction over human conscience, that the Church shall take care of spiritual things, and leave the State and civil things alone, is in harmony with the Scriptures. The separation of Church and State, religious liberty, is guaranteed to our Republic in these words: 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' The prerogative of religious instruction is in the home and the church, and it must remain there. The public schools are doing their part, in their legitimate way, and they are doing all they can do. It is for the home and the church to do their part, in their legitimate sphere, and to do all they can.

"Says one: 'Parents are not doing their duty; they are not bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The Sunday-school, blessed institution that it is, reaches only a corner of the field. Multitudes of children are dying or growing up without being brought to the knowledge of Christ. Countless children slip away from the Sunday-school, never becoming church-members, owing to the fact that religion soon ceases to interest and appeal to them.' Granted! What are you going to do about it? Ask the Government if it cannot do something in the matter? Ask

the public school if it cannot do something to promote the religious education of the people? Hands off the public school!

"The public schools shall not teach religion, for that would mean the mingling of Church and State. They can promote the moral, but not the religious education of the children. When a public school teacher says to her scholars, 'It is wrong to kill, to steal,' she is not necessarily teaching religion. The State law forbids murder and theft. But if she adds, 'Thus says the Lord God,' she then and there becomes a teacher of religion; she joins together what God has put asunder, Church and State. It is not for the State to expound the Word of God. It is not for the State to give answer to the question, 'What shall I do to become and remain a Christian? What shall I do to be saved?' But it is for the State to give answer to the question, 'What shall I do to become and remain a useful and law-abiding citizen?'"

ATTEMPTS TO TEACH RELIGION.

"We cannot but view with concern the attempts which are made to override this fundamental law of our land, the separation of Church and State. There are schools in which portions of the Bible are read each morning. In addition to reading the Bible, the Lord's Prayer is recited audibly in concert under direction of the teachers. During school-hours sacred hymns are sung by the pupils. During such exercises the pupils are required to rise in their seats, fold their hands, and bow their heads. These exercises are in violation of the State law, because they are devotional exercises, and violate the right of free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship. One does not enjoy the free exercise of religious worship who is compelled to join in any form of worship.

"What is worship? Webster's Dictionary says: 'The act of paying divine honor to the Supreme Being.' Worship includes prayer, praise, thanksgiving. Prayer is always worship. Reading the Bible and singing may be worship. 'Rock of Ages,' 'There is a Fountain Filled with Blood, Drawn from Immanuel's Veins,' are devotional hymns of religious joy and praise for the flood of grace flowing from the cross on Calvary. Now, if children are required to join in the acts of worship against their consent and against the wishes of their parents, they are deprived of the freedom of religious worship guaranteed to them by the Constitution. The wrong arises, not out of the particular version of the Bible, or the form of prayer, or the particular songs sung, but out of the compulsion to join in any form of worship. The free enjoyment of religious worship includes freedom not to worship.

"I ask: What right have the teachers of the public school to compel the children of Roman Catholics to read the King James Version of the Bible? No more than a Catholic public school teacher would have to compel Protestant children to read the Douay Bible. What right has a teacher to teach her pupils a religious doctrine different from that which they are taught by their parents? What right has the State to teach the child of the Jew the Lord's Prayer? The Jew denies that Christ is the Messiah, and regards Him as an impostor. Is it right to compel his child to read daily from the New Testament, every chapter of which holds up Christ crucified as the Savior of the world? What right has the public school to compel the child of a Unitarian or a Christian Scientist to sing a song that treats of Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God and Savior of men? If their children may be compelled to listen to, and learn, the Gospel of Christ, the Savior, the same law will authorize them to compel our children to learn the doctrines of Unitarianism and Christian Science. Our Constitution has wisely provided against any such contest by excluding sectarian instruction altogether from the school.

ALL SHADES OF RELIGION.

"Clinging with utmost tenacity to this invaluable temporal possession, the separation of Church and State, zealous to retain for ourselves and our children the blessing of religious liberty in the fullest and truest sense of the term, we say: The public school shall not teach religion. And let me add: It cannot teach religion, at least not the true, the Christian, religion. All shades of religious opinions are represented in this country. It is utterly out of the question to attempt to teach the particular doctrines of any denomination or dogmatic theology of any kind. Even if Protestants could agree on some ground, which is improbable, what kind of a conglomerate would that be which would be acceptable alike to Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, and agnostics? It would not be the Christian religion. The thing is inconceivable. Even an attempt to introduce such religious education into the public school would be disastrous.

"In certain quarters of the Church it is claimed that the State ought to contribute a portion of the school fund for the support of the parochial schools. Lutherans answer, 'We do not want a cent of public money for Lutheran schools,' and we are opposed to a division of the school fund, because it is beset with dangers to religious freedom. The Constitution, Article 8, Section 3, prohibits the appropriation of any public funds in aid of any Church or sectarian

purpose, or for the support of any school, academy, college, or university controlled by any Church or sectarian denomination.

"In 1876, General Grant feelingly said: 'If we are to have another contest in the future of our national existence, the dividing line will not be the Mason and the Dixon's, but between intelligence and patriotism, and ignorance and ambition. Let us labor for free press, free speech; keep Church and State distinct. Let not one dollar appropriated for education be given over to sectarian schools.'

"And to Grant's sentiment all true Americans, from the lakes to the gulf, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, will say Amen, and Amen."

REV. A. BOTH, of Chicago, communicates the following excerpt, which he copied from the Bible published by John Murphy Co., 44 N. Baltimore St., Baltimore, Md., and 70 Fifth St., New York, printers to the Holy See:

THE
HOLY BIBLE

Translated from the Latin Vulgate.

— — —
APPROBATION
of

HIS EMINENCE JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

— — —

We hereby approve of the publication by Messrs. John Murphy Co. of the Catholic Bible, which is an accurate reprint of the Rheims and Douay edition with Dr. Challoner's Notes.

The sacred volume is printed in an attractive style.

Baltimore, September 1, 1899.

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

— — —

PREFACE.

At the earnest solicitation of large numbers of the religious bodies and laity, we herewith beg leave to introduce to the public a most convenient edition of the Sacred Scriptures, approved by his Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, whose recommendation we herewith append.

The Sacred Scriptures form a part of divine revelation, the other part being contained in the depository of the Church, and designated as the unwritten Word of God.

This distinction is most happily found couched in the language of St. Paul (2 Thess. 2, 14): "Wherefore, brethren, stand fast, and

hold the traditions which ye have learned, whether by word or by our epistle." The Apostle of the Gentiles thus gives precedence to the unwritten Word of God presented to man by the Church, whilst she, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, assumes the office of sole interpreter of the written Word, thereby rendering her the sole guardian of the deposit of divine revelation in its twofold form.

On the written revelation it is highly appropriate that we should here address a few remarks to our readers.

As the book about to be once more presented to the public in a new form claims for itself an origin exclusively divine, we deem it not out of place to furnish, in outline at least, the grounds of that claim.

The work is divided unequally into two parts, *viz.*, the Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament is a record of God's relations with man antecedently to the advent of the incarnate Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ. The New Testament contains a compendium of the lives of our Savior and His Apostles, as recorded by the Evangelists and other Apostles.

As to the first part, or Old Testament, the version always recognized by the Church contains many more books than that used by other than Catholics. The reason of this discrepancy is that the Church's version, the Septuagint, the Greek translation from the original Hebrew, and which contained all the writings now found in the Douay Version, as it is called, was the version used by the Savior and His Apostles and by the Church from her infancy, and translated into Latin, known under the title of Latin Vulgate, and ever recognized as the true version of the written Word of God.

Hence the Old Testament, containing as it does all embraced in the Septuagint, is not only genuine and authentic, but having the approbation of our Savior and His Apostles, who quoted it exclusively whilst on earth, has superadded to it the supreme character of divine inspiration, which it possesses to the exclusion of all other versions. It stands, therefore, before the world as the sole claimant for integrity, genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration; in a word, as the possessor of every attribute necessary to constitute what no other work can lay claim to, *viz.*, a divinely inspired volume.

Of the genuineness and authenticity of the more recent part of this sacred Book, *viz.*, the New Testament, there exists no doubt; but as to its inspiration the gravest doubts may exist unless an infallible witness thereof can be produced. Whatever grounds may exist vouching for the inspiration of the Apostles as writers, no security whatsoever can be forthcoming for the inspiration of the quotas

furnished by Sts. Mark and Luke, the former the writer of a Gospel, the latter also the writer of a Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles; these quotas, forming a prominent part in the composition of the New Testament, remain uninspired, their authors not being Apostles. The only solution to this difficulty is to be found in the testimony of the Church of Christ, which He commands to "hear," and against which He pledges Himself that "the gates of hell cannot prevail." Her decision, by virtue of the guaranty of her Founder, exalts the New Testament to the dignity of a divinely inspired production, and as she vouches also for the divine character of the Old Testament, we submit to our readers a work that, alone of all publications, comprises, with all the evidences of infallible certitude, the only divine production on earth. The Church of Jesus Christ, by virtue of her divinely endowed infallibility, vouches for the divine origin of the Sacred Scriptures, and as such we respectfully, but confidently, submit them to the public.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concōrdia Publishing House, St. Louis:—

1. *BIBLE HISTORY REFERENCES*. Explanatory Notes on the Lessons Embodied in *Bible History for Parochial Schools*. Compiled by *F. Rupperecht*. IX and 294 pages. With sixteen illustrations and two maps. \$1.10.

A generation ago one of the leading schoolmen of the Lutheran Church in America expressed the opinion that the importance of Bible History teaching in the training of children was not recognized as it should be, even in religious schools. He held that of all the branches of instruction in the Christian training of the young Bible History is the most necessary,

1. Because it is the basis of all religious training;
2. Because children grasp it with the greatest ease and speed.

The force of the first assertion will be admitted upon a little reflection. The Christian religion is not an intellectual philosophy or a congeries of moral sentiments. Were it such, it would either have no history, or that history could be treated as a negligible element in the inculcation of Christianity. The logical and ethical mind of man, being religiously sufficient unto itself, would in every generation and individual evolve Christianity out of itself. Men would only have to be directed to their mental inwardness to discover Christianity there.

But Christianity, the Christian faith, approaches the mind of man from without in the form of historical facts. It is a revealed religion. It has happened. There are records of it. Its tenets have been authoritatively stated by God, who has, so to speak, stepped out of His eternal and invisible existence, and has in the arena of time

and space wrought acts, and explained the meaning of acts, which the faith of Christians embraces.

"Christian faith rests on the divine revelation, on historical facts. Only where these facts are known can we admit the existence of the Christian religion and of a sound life of faith. Whoever, in particular, would be known as a true 'Lutheran' must needs know the stories of the creation of the universe and of the human race, of the fall, of the promise of redemption, of the gathering and guidance of the Church of God in Old Testament times, of the coming of the Messiah, of the perfect redemption of the entire world, — in brief, the history which the Holy Spirit has narrated in the Bible. Besides, this history, more than any other, affords a person true culture; for it is not only true in every respect, but it has been told in such a way as to really benefit the reader. Only he who has learned, from his study of Bible History, to understand the doings of God can form a correct judgment of the events in the history of the world and of the Church. Hence it is that a God-fearing peasant not infrequently views historical events with a better understanding than a learned professor who lacks the Biblical foundation in his training." (Lindemann, *Schulpraxis*, p. 22, and *passim*.)

As to the second assertion, that children love Bible History more than any other study, and rapidly become proficient in this study, nothing need be said, because every one who has had to do with the training of children admits this fact.

Necessarily, the importance of the study of Bible History implies, to the teacher, the importance of thorough preparation, in order that he may be able to teach efficiently this fundamental branch of religious instruction. He must have a commanding grasp of the subject of each lesson; he must properly divide each story according to its principal elements, and point the particular lesson to be conveyed by each story. If the lesson contains strange or obsolete terms and phrases, he must be prepared to reproduce their meaning in terms that are understood by his pupils. He must be able to fix the events narrated geographically and chronologically, explain facts of natural history, social customs, etc. He may also have to find illustrations that shall exhibit to the eye of the pupil what he cannot well convey to his mind by words.

The *Bible History References* offered to the Bible-reading public in this volume have grown out of the conviction that the teachers of Bible History need a book that provides, in the readiest form, the information on a thousand points which they must have in order to possess a teacher's knowledge of the story which they are to tell to their pupils. This is especially necessary in the case of Sunday-school teachers who have not had a special course in pedagogy to equip them for independent Bible-study and research work. But even the trained teacher, who has been in the habit of working out his own references and notes with the aid of a more or less reliable Bible Dictionary, will find much material in this volume by means of which he is enabled to verify the results of his own research work. For this volume, small though it may appear, embodies the fruit of the labors of respectable Bible-scholars. The greater part of the contents are from an originally German source, entitled, *Hilfsbuch zur Biblischen Ge-*

schichte, by W. Simon; but through the good rendering which Mr. F. Rupprecht has given the original, and the additions which he has himself made to the original, the book has become a good vernacular product that deserves to be well received by all who employ the English language in the Lutheran Church of America in the teaching of children in schools and Sunday-schools.

2. *TROSTBRUENNLEIN AM KRANKENBETT*. Von Fr. F. Selle, Shawano, Wis. 109 pages. 55 cts.

The visitation of the sick is one of the most important and not the least exacting of the tasks of the pastoral office. It is a wise pastor that understands the rare opportunities for effective ministrations which are opened up to him at the sick-bed. For these visits the minister should, in a general way, be prepared all the time; for in the nature of the case his services will often be demanded on short notice. But not infrequently there may be cases which call for special study. Any hint as to what he ought to say, and how he can best word his message, will be gratefully received, especially by the busy pastor. Rev. Selle's book, which has evidently grown out of the multi-experiences that come to every wide-awake pastor in his ministry, and which reveals discriminating search of the Scriptures and of the vicissitudes of life in the state of mortality, is an admirable help to the pastor in his ministration to the sick and the dying. The author begins his treatise with six meditations on our temporal afflictions. These are followed by fourteen brief talks to adults, each based on a passage of Scripture, and concluding with a prayer. The third division contains five similar addresses for use when the patient has been the victim of an accident, or is to undergo a surgical operation, and desires Communion. The fourth division offers three talks to children, and is arranged after the same plan as those in the two divisions preceding. The fifth division is made up of four prayers and sixteen appropriate Bible readings. The sixth division contains thirty-two poetical selections from the hymn-book and other sources. The next three divisions are designed for use when attending those critically ill and the dying. They contain brief Bible-texts, selections from hymns, and prayers. At the end there is a liturgical formula for sick-communion.

3. *SUNDAY-SCHOOL PRAYERS*. (English and German.) Compiled by C. Abbtmeyer. 24 pages. 10 cts.

The publisher is right in claiming "a distinct need for this booklet." It contains 19 opening, 14 closing prayers, and 13 prayers for special occasions, in English, and the same number, in fact the identical prayers as regards contents, in German.

4. A doctrinal paper (German) on *JESUS CHRIST, OUR SAVIOR, ACCORDING TO JOHN 1*, read before the Oregon and Washington District Synod by Rev. W. J. Janssen. 27 pages. 10 cts.

5. A doctrinal paper on *CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP*, read before the English District Synod, by Rev. M. Walker. 30 pp. 13 cts.

Success Printing Co., St. Louis:—

HOMILETISCHES REALLEXIKON nebst Index Rerum. Von E. Eckhardt. S—T. \$2.10, plus postage.

This is the seventh volume of Rev. Eckhardt's enterprise, which has proved a success far beyond expectations and a most serviceable means for discovering anything of moment that has appeared in the publications of the Missouri and allied synods. The present volume has indexed the literature on such topics as "Sabbat," "Sakramente," "Schrift," "Seligkeit," "Sonntag," "Spiritismus," "Suende," "Synergismus," "Synode," "Taufe," "Temperaenz," "Theologie," "Union," etc. From 300 to 400 outlines for funeral addresses are offered under the legend "Tod." References to wedding discourses are published under "Traureden."—Vol. 8 of this publication is completed in manuscript, and will conclude the work.

THE RELIGION OF THE LODGE. A Sermon Delivered in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, St. Paul, Minn., by Rev. O. C. Kreinheder. Published by request. 18 pages.

Broadly basing his remarks on Ps. 1, the author's animated and convincing discourse exhibits the idolatrous worship, the Christless prayer, the faithless salvation, and the loveless charity of the religion of Masonry and Odd-Fellowship.

The Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia:—

THE TRUTH OF THE APOSTLES' CREED. An Exposition by Twelve Theologians of Germany. Edited by William Laible, D.D. Translated by Charles E. Hay, D.D. 217 pages. \$1.

Towards the close of the year 1913 and in the early part of the year 1914, there appeared in the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* of Leipsic a remarkable series of articles on the Apostles' Creed. The reason for this publication was stated by the editor as follows: "The attacks upon the Apostles' Creed, the oldest confession of the Church, which still forms a bond of union for us even with Roman Catholic believers, have assumed so general and serious a character that great uneasiness has been occasioned in wide circles. There has been an impression that no scientific theologian could longer be found who would be willing or able to take a serious stand in its defense. These ideas are promulgated in our schools and universities, and earnest efforts are already being made to crowd it out of our church services, and thus out of the life of the Church at large. It is needless to say that a deadly blow would thus be struck at the very heart of our Christian populace." There were thirteen articles: Dr. N. Bonwetsch, Professor of Church History at Goettingen, furnished an introductory article, historical in its main features, on the question, "What is the Creed to Us?" (pp. 11—28.) The text of the Three Articles was distributed for treatment, somewhat after the manner in which the ancient legend says the Creed was composed by the twelve apostles, among the following twelve theologians: Dr. T. Kaftan, General Superintendent of Schleswig ("I Believe in God, the Almighty Father"), pp. 29—40; Dr. K. Dunkmann, Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology at Greifswald ("Maker of Heaven and Earth"), pp. 41—54; Dr. J. Haussleiter,

Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Greifswald ("I Believe in Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, Our Lord"), pp. 55—69; Dr. R. Gruetzmacher, Professor of Systematic Theology at Erlangen ("Conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary"), pp. 70—85; Dr. P. Althaus, Professor of Systematic Theology at Leipsic ("Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Crucified, Dead, Buried, Descended into Hell"), pp. 86—96; Dr. L. Ihmels, Professor of Dogmatics and Ethics at Leipsic ("On the Third Day He Rose Again from the Dead"), pp. 97—110; Dr. A. Schlatter, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Tuebingen ("He Ascended into Heaven, and Sitteth on the Right Hand of God, the Father Almighty"), pp. 111 to 121; Dr. G. Wohlenberg, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Erlangen ("From thence He Shall Come to Judge the Quick and the Dead"), pp. 122—139; Dr. P. Bachmann, Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis at Erlangen ("I Believe in the Holy Ghost"), pp. 140—162; Dr. Wilhelm Walther, Professor of Church History at Rostock ("A Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints"), pp. 163—184; Dr. E. Weber, Professor of Systematic and Historical Theology at Bonn ("The Forgiveness of Sin"), pp. 185—207; Dr. K. Bornhaeuser, Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology at Marburg ("Resurrection of the Flesh and a Life Everlasting"), pp. 208—217.

This series of studies on the doctrinal contents of the first of the Ecumenical Symbols of the Church has now been made accessible to English readers in a very good translation, prepared by Dr. Chas. E. Hay, and published under the title aforesaid. The translator says: "Every assault upon the truth in the history of the Church has hitherto been overruled for its firmer establishment in the minds of men. The recent determined opposition to some portions of the Apostles' Creed in Germany has already furnished a further illustration of this historical phenomenon. The Church does wisely in gathering the results of every conflict, and preserving them among her treasures. We in America have reason to rejoice in our freedom from many perplexities arising from the too intimate connection of Church and State. As the discussion of the Creed, in consequence, does not assume for us a legal aspect, we are in position to consider it simply upon its merits. Our danger is that we may, in the absence of direct opposition, fail to appreciate this form of sound words as we should. The same influences which in other lands give rise to questions of ecclesiastical order are only too actively at work among us in seeking insidiously to undermine the faith of our people in the old doctrines centering in the person and work of Christ as the divine Redeemer." This estimate of the merit which the German publication possesses for the Church in America is correct. We can more calmly and disinterestedly than a member of the German state-church weigh the tenableness and the claims for permanency of the Creed. Even a cursory reading of the pithy articles contributed by leading theologians of Germany suggests the wealth of doctrinal material of a fundamental character that has been embodied in these essays. And the duty of every loyal Lutheran is to measure the findings by these German professors by the *norma normans*, by which the Church has measured the Apostles' Creed itself. These essays

require study, and we reserve the right, after this introductory mention of the publication, to take up some of the articles for special review.

There are some things, however, which deserve to be noted at once, as they indicate the standpoint of the writers. Speaking of the changes in the phraseology of the Creed, Dr. Bonwetsch says: "The changes which have been made in it should teach us to regard it, not as a formula in itself sacred, but as a living entity, and not to cling to each separate part, but apprehend it as a whole. Guided by its history, we will, therefore, place a different valuation upon that which belonged to it from the time of its origin, and that which was added at a comparatively late day." (p. 17; comp. p. 21, last paragraph.) "To bind exclusively to any definite form of confession would be entirely contrary to the spirit of Protestantism. In confirmation and ordination, as well as in the stated services of the Church, another form of confession might fittingly set forth our salvation through Christ." (p. 24.) "We do not recognize the binding obligation to the formula which is characteristic of Catholic Christianity." (p. 25.) When Dr. Kaftan, omitting any mention of the Trinity, says: "This is the stupendous, incomprehensible fact that eternal Power has, in that Jesus who was Christ, revealed itself as our Father" (p. 37), and we remember that he has defined God as "personality" (p. 34 f.), we wonder whether the "revelation" of the Father in Christ comports with the strict Trinitarian view of the three distinct persons in the one divine essence. Nor is the situation relieved of obscurity by Dr. Haussleiter's remarks: "The historical revelation of God through Christ in the Spirit was viewed and recognized as an inner, living unity. Those who call upon the name of Jesus Christ had not surrendered the monotheistic faith of Israel [?], but that faith had received from them a fulness of living power of which the synagog in its frigid conception of God had no suspicion." (p. 63.) Dr. Dunkmann is outspoken in his denunciations of the modern scientific substitutes for creation, that is, the creative act of God, but he thinks that the modern man, thanks to the advance of scientific research, is able to put more meaning into the Creed than the early Christians ("But we—we know all about the heavens and the earth," p. 46), and he has nothing to say on the hexaemeron. Dr. Althaus's representation of the atonement is unsatisfactory, because it locates the redemptive efficacy of the life and death, not in the *satisfactio vicaria*, but in the fact that "the deeds and sufferings of Jesus became a means of atonement only through the fact that they are manifestations of His personal life, acts of this Person, Christ." (p. 91.) The same writer regards the statement concerning the descent as parallel to the statement concerning the burial of Christ. Just to what extent concessions have been made to the modern mind in these efforts to justify to that mind the retention of the oldest confession of Christendom we are not prepared to say. A penetrating study will have to reveal this. In all the articles the reader receives a most favorable impression by the fervor and, in instances, the beauty with which the writers express their thought, by their frequent challenge of modern skepticism, and their apparent determination to cling to the old faith.

Forbes and Company, Chicago:—

1. *FALSE MODESTY THAT PROTECTS VICE BY IGNORANCE*. 110 pages. 50 cts.
2. *TRUTHS*. Talks with a Boy concerning Himself. 95 pages. 50 cts.
3. *CONFIDENCES*. Talks with a Young Girl concerning Herself. 94 pages. 50 cts.
4. *YOUR BABY*. A Guide for Young Mothers. 238 pages and Index. \$1.
5. *HERSELF*. Talks with Women concerning Themselves. 208 pp. and Index. \$1.

All these books are by *Dr. E. B. Lowry*.

6. *HIMSELF*. Talks with Men concerning Themselves. By *Dr. E. B. Lowry* and *Dr. Richard J. Lambert*. 194 pages and Index. \$1.
7. *HAPPY SCHOOL DAYS*. By *Margaret E. Sangster*. 271 pages. \$1.00.
8. *BOY WANTED*. A Book of Cheerful Counsel. By *Nixon Waterman*. 134 pages. \$1.
9. *THE GIRL WANTED*. A Book of Friendly Thoughts. By the same author. 158 pages. \$1.

We frankly confess to a feeling of uneasiness every time a book on sex hygiene and the sex relations is placed on our table with the request: Give us your opinion of it. There was a time when we considered any book of this kind a good book, 1) because it supplied an acknowledged need, 2) because its author had the moral courage to speak plainly on avoided subjects. The vagaries which have in recent years accompanied the eugenics movement,—if the whole movement is not a vagary!—and a few publications that we had to leaf through, have caused us to look critically at all sex publications. Upon the whole, it seems that we have reached a stage in the teaching given to the young in our country in regard to the sex relations where a check is demanded. Under pretense of teaching what is necessary there are things divulged and matters expatiated on that need not be stated at all to a young person, or disposed of in a few words. From criminal indifference we are advancing to a zeal that is no less criminal, because it is overdoing the publicity that is desirable for the subject under consideration. The five books of *Dr. Lowry* and the cooperative volume which he has produced together with *Dr. Lambert*, we are glad to state, are clean, sensible, plain talks, tempered with the chaste reserve of a gentleman. They are primarily dictated by a philanthropic concern for our physical health. They deal with the laws of our natural existence as intelligent and moral beings. The religious aspects of personal purity and its opposites are hardly touched upon. On the same subjects discussed in these books the theologian, the pastor, would have many things to say that would be stated on a different authority and from a different motive and for a different end than those recognized in these books. But we would not depreciate the merits of these on that account: it is desirable that the medical expert talk to us on the subjects of

pubescence, manhood, womanhood, purely from the standpoint of his science. We question, however, whether the remarks in No. 5, p. 146, on the limitation of the privilege to marry, and p. 158 ff., on the limitation of offspring, are medically defensible. Especially the last subject is revolting to a religious mind. And whether the sterilization of the unfit will not work greater evils than the existing is at least open to question. We tremble at the application of any law to this effect when we think of the incapacity of the average officers of the State who would have to apply the law.—The two books by Nixon Waterman are collections of striking sayings by many authors on virtuous and vicious habits. They are woven into discourses, and are presented with great enthusiasm and a fine air of conviction. But they hardly ever rise above the plane of common secular morality. It is natural religion that they preach.—Nearly of the same type, but written in a more genial spirit, is Margaret Sangster's book, which abounds in practical advice, and breathes spirituality, though it makes education to rest "on the alphabet, the multiplication table, and the Ten Commandments."

The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia:—

STORY OF THE BIBLE. Self-Pronouncing. The Complete Bible Story, Running from Genesis to Revelation, Told in the Simple Language of To-day for Young and Old. One Hundred and Sixty-eight Stories. By Rev. Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, D.D. Profusely illustrated. 757 pages. \$1.50.

This book has been purposely called, not "Stories from the Bible," but the *Story of the Bible*, because it aims "to tell all the principal stories in their connected order, and in such relation with each other as to form a continuous history." "Every story has its title, one that will arrest the attention of the reader, whether old or young." Thus Gen. 1, 1—3, 24 is told in the "Story of a Beautiful Garden"; Cain and Abel are treated in "The First Baby in the World and His Brother"; the story of the Flood, in "The Great Ship that Saved Eight People"; the Lord's sermon at Nazareth, in "A Riot in Nazareth"; the Baptist's death, in "A Dancing Girl, and What was Given Her"; the healing of the blind man at Jerusalem, in "The Man with Clay on His Face"; the story of Calvary, in "The Darkest Day of All the World"; the story of Easter, in "The Brightest Day of All the World," etc.—"Special care has been given to the language of this book, . . . to make it plain without making it childish. . . . Doctrinal and technical terms have been everywhere excluded, and in place of them plain, familiar words have been given." "In my opinion," says the author, "many books containing stories from the Bible are greatly marred by the evident attempt to interject a body of divinity into them, to make them teach doctrines which may be right or may be wrong, but are not stated nor hinted in the Scripture-stories. Some excellent works have occupied much space here and there in trying to connect with Bible stories the deepest and most mysterious doctrines, which theologians find hard to understand. Others contain many moral reflections and applications, which may be useful, but are not contained in the text of the story. I have sought to explain what needs explanation, but to avoid all doctrinal

bias, and not to be wise above what is written. Only in a few instances, where the New Testament warrants a spiritual interpretation of the Old Testament story, has an application been given, and then in the simplest and fewest words. It is my confident hope that all denominations of Christians may feel at home in the pages of this book." This non-committal attitude of the author may account for the hazy way in which he tells parts of the story of creation: "No one knows when the world was made." "God called the dark time Night, and the light time Day. And that was the first day upon earth after a long night." "Then God said, 'Let the sun and moon and stars come into sight from the earth.'" The curse upon "the snake" means this: "Because you have led Adam and Eve to do wrong, you shall no more walk as do other animals; you shall crawl in the dust and the dirt forever. You shall hate the woman, and the woman shall hate you. You shall try to kill her and her children, and her children's children forever, and they shall try to kill you." The rejection of Cain's offering is told thus: "For some reason God was pleased with Abel and his offering, but was not pleased with Cain and his offering. Perhaps God wished Cain to offer something that had life, as Abel offered; perhaps Cain's heart was not right when he came before God." This latter is the Scriptural reason; there is no "perhaps" about it. The solemn conversation of God with Cain before the slaying of Abel is ignored. — We should note also a few extra-Biblical statements of the author in the New Testament. "Jesus was not the only child in Joseph and Mary's house; for other sons and daughters were given to them." "John baptized them in the Jordan, as a sign that their sins were washed away," etc. Still, the author knows excellently to tell a Bible-story in a way that will fascinate any person, and in this respect parents and teachers can really learn a great deal from this book.

Sherman, French, and Company, Boston: —

PARADOXICAL PAIN. By Robert Maxwell Harbin, A. B., M. D., F. A. C. S. 212 pages. \$1.25.

Human pain in its beneficent results is exhibited in this study of absorbing interest. That is the paradoxical feature of pain that it becomes a constructive element in our lives, while it seems to spell destruction and ruin only. "For instance, we would say that vaccination is a paradoxical disease set up to harden vitality and prevent the development of the real disease, the one being protective and the other destructive in its effects." However, this observation can be applied, not only to the physical, but also to the mental and spiritual side of our present life. "Defeat has a share in bringing success, certain forms of anxiety bring tranquillity, and fear, fortitude. In the spiritual realms, suffering may increase the capacity for enjoyment; unselfishness becomes a legitimate form of selfishness; the pain of striving to do right, a necessary process of education; self-sacrifice, a means of getting more out of life; giving, a process of getting; temptation, a means of greater strength; abasement, a form of self-exaltation; discontent, necessarily the first step of contentment. Grief is not grief when joy comes in the morn, remorse becomes healthful because of betterment of conduct, and old age a mine

of peace and wisdom, and death, by finally casting off the enemies of spiritual peace, becomes a friend to the hope of immortality — the highest aim ever recorded in the history of human aspiration, for to achieve is human, but to aspire is divine. We are ever unsatisfied, but never dissatisfied." (p. VII.) This excerpt indicates the scope of the author's argument: he wants to show "that pain is not merely an incident in the beneficent order of things, but a profound cause from which the greatest blessings flow." The reader can imagine what a rich field of application the author finds for this truth at every stage of the development of a human being from the pangs of birth to the agonies of death, from infancy to old age, and in every department of human activity. It is a book that takes hold of the reader, not only by its fascinating matter, but also by the exquisite manner which the author possesses for stating aptly, tersely, pithily what he wishes to say. The book fairly teems with life, and abounds in striking reflections, observations, and judgments. Witness the following, which the author quotes from President Butler of Columbia University: "The marvelous last half century of science has made absolutely no impression on the thinking habit. Science has destroyed many prepossessions and not a few beliefs, but it has not yet taught mankind to think. Our age is far less reflective than was the eighteenth or the first half of the nineteenth century; our people are now ever busy hunting for something new." Or: "The freest man who ever lived was Paul, who was in chains and prison." (p. 131.) Or: "Diseased conditions furnish scant opportunity for studying normal psychology; for the mind under such circumstances may show few traces of normality. I do not recall ever seeing but one case of death that gave any data that seemed to be worthy of study." (p. 183.) Or: "Suicide is a moral wrong." (p. 188.) — There are places where the spirit of questioning doubt and open dissent will assert itself in the reader, as, *e. g.*, the author's view of the innate moral strength and liberty of man. (Comp. p. 157.) The deep depravity which has settled upon the intellect and will of natural man, as the Bible exhibits it, is not recognized. The definition of conscience as "the superior spirit, which guides us by and through the intellect" (p. 69), opens up the old question whether the will sways the thought, or *vice versa*. The coordination of the vicarious suffering of Christ with the vicarious suffering of which the world of society is full weakens the redemptive force of the atonement. Nevertheless, the book is worth careful reading, and apt to enrich the reader's knowledge of this life of pain and sorrow. D.

Revell & Co., New York: —

THE BOOKS OF THE APOCRYPHA. Their Origin, Teaching, and Contents. By the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. 1914. 553 pages, 5½×9. Price, \$3.00 net.

This is a very full discussion of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, their teaching and contents, and the problems connected with their origin. The scope of the work may be gathered from the following chapter-headings of Part One: The Hellenistic Movement, Hellenistic Influences upon the Jews of Palestine, Hellenistic Influences upon the Jews of the Dispersion, Traces of Greek Influence in the New Testament and in the Apocrypha, The Apocalyptic Move-

ment, The Scribes, The Pharisees and Sadducees, Origin of the Old Testament Canon, Uncanonical Books, Apocalyptic Literature, Wisdom Literature, Doctrinal Teaching of the Apocrypha. Part Two contains introductions to the separate apocryphal books, and discusses their origin and contents. Rev. Oesterley, in the main, accepts the naturalistic view of modern theologians concerning the origin of the Scriptures, and this doctrinal position colors the work throughout. A considerable number of Psalms are referred to the Maccabean era, and are supposed to contain many Hellenistic elements. How doubtful is the evidence for the presence of Greek influences in the Old Testament writings may be understood when we note, on page 72, that the well-known description of the wanton woman in Prov. 2 is given an allegorical meaning: "This 'strange woman' is undoubtedly an allegorical person; she is a personification of the new Hellenistic spirit, which, on its bad side, encouraged unbridled license, and led away from God." An altogether arbitrary assumption, without a scintilla of evidence in the text. Also the personification of Wisdom, in chap. 8 of the Proverbs, is made, on what grounds we know not, an argument for Hellenistic influence. The Book of Job is likewise referred to as proof for Hellenistic influence upon the Hebrew Scriptures,—“we have here, without doubt, a Hebrew imitation of the philosophic dialog of Plato.” Stade, Holtzmann, and Cheyne are quoted in support of similar views concerning Ecclesiastes. On what slender evidence this reasoning rests may be gathered from a statement on page 79, which refers the enumeration of the five senses in Ben Sira, chap. 17, 4, to Stoic influence; as if no one outside the Stoa could be trusted with enough perspicacity to enumerate the five senses! Again, the mention of banquets in Ben Sira is made a proof of Greek influence: “He mentions banquets accompanied by brilliant conversation, at which musical instruments were heard,”—as if the Jews invariably took their meals in silence and solitude! The doctrine of the preexistence of the soul, of immortality, the creation of the world out of formless matter, are likewise made echoes of Platonic philosophy. The influence of Higher Criticism is evident throughout these chapters of Rev. Oesterley's book. “Belief in a future life among the Jews was largely due to Greek thought”; “the Pharisees developed this tenet from the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul to a definite belief in the resurrection of the body”; the expectation of universal sway for the religion of Israel was “inspired by Hellenistic influence.” Such definite assertions of Platonic, Stoic, and Epicurean influence recur throughout this volume, mostly on the authority of Friedlaender's *Griechische Philosophie*. The distinction of Apocryphal and Canonical Old Testament writings is, p. 305, declared to be “quite arbitrary.” Throughout there is present the naturalistic conception of the origin of the Scriptures. Mere coincidences of word and phrasing in Paul's letters are adduced as proof for the influence of the Apocrypha upon the New Testament. It is clear that also the better portions of Rev. Oesterley's book, as when he discusses the origin of scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, of the Wisdom literature, can be read only with constant misgivings when the author so patently is bound up in the tenets of a theory which ignores the element of divine revelation in the canonical Scriptures. The para-

mount question, How did the undeniably historical distinction of apocryphal and canonical books arise in the Jewish Church? receives no answer. Oesterley follows several extreme critics, who place the completion of the canon as late as 100 A. D., while no conservative and sane investigator has assumed a date later than 125 B. C. and every probability points to the time of Ezra as the age when the Jewish canon was accepted substantially in the form in which we have our Old Testament writings now. Proceeding, as it does, from the higher critical theory of Old Testament origins, Rev. Oesterley's book cannot be a safe guide to the study of the Apocrypha. G.

Geo. H. Doran Company, New York:—

The first number of Vol. IV of the *CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY* contains a review of the Orthodox Church of Constantinople, by Prof. Ivan Ivanovitch Sokoloff, of the Ecclesiastical Academy at Petrograd; Some Aspects and Problems of Mission in the Far East, by Dr. R. E. Speer, the Lay Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in America; Prayer and the Answer to Prayer, by Dr. Friedrich Niebergall, of the University of Heidelberg; The Holy Eucharist, by J. T. F. Farquhar, Rector of the Episcopal Church at Fochabers, Scotland; Immortality and the Person of Jesus Christ, by T. R. Glover, of Cambridge; Fundamental Characteristics of New Testament Christology, by Dr. Reinhold Seeberg, of Erlangen; Intellectual Theodicy in France, by Clément Besse, of the Catholic Institute of St. Germain-en-Laye; The Basic Call for the World Conference on Church Unity, by Dr. Junius B. Remensnyder, of New York; Catholicity and Nationality, by Richard Roberts, Presbyterian minister at London; Christianity a Unifying Power in War Time, by Ernest Rochat, of the University of Geneva; Archbishop Theodore: English Church Reunion in the Seventh Century, by Dr. Benj. W. Wells, of the University of the South.

From Dr. J. N. Lenker, Minneapolis, Minn., we have received Vol. II, No. 2, of the *NORTHERN REVIEW*, War and Peace Magazine for Northwest, containing two articles of Prof. Bente: Argument on American Neutrality and My Visit in Washington, and from D. R. Reiser his tract *Down Grade*, a critical review of the signs of the time foreshadowing the Second Coming of the Lord.

A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig:—

HEBRAEISCHE SPRACHLEHRE. Grammatik, Vokabular und Uebungsstuecke. Von Dr. theol. et phil. Wilhelm Lotz, o. Professor an der Universitaet Erlangen. Zweite, durchgesehene und vermehrte Auflage. IV and 173 pages, with a supplementary vocabulary of 16 pages. M. 3.60.

Thirty years of experience in teaching Hebrew at Vienna and Erlangen have enabled the author to give us in this revised edition of his popular *Sprachlehre* one of the most practical guides now extant for beginning the study of Hebrew, and carrying it forward to that degree of efficiency which will enable the student to read the Codex of the Old Testament intelligently, without laborious references to lexicon and grammar. D.